



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 24, 2014

No. 46

## House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. UPTON).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC.

March 24, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable FRED UPTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

### THE STATESVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, JOB FAIR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my pleasure to attend a job fair at Mitchell Community College in Statesville, North Carolina. The job fair was cohosted by the Statesville Chamber of Commerce; and both Mitchell Community College president Dr. Tim Brewer and Chamber president David Bradley and their staffs are to be commended for making this important event hap-

pen and making these job opportunities available to jobseekers in the local community.

As a former community college president, I am aware of the important role these institutions play in providing workers with the opportunity to improve their skills in order to meet the demands of employers.

Mitchell Community College and the Statesville Chamber of Commerce both played large roles in ensuring that Statesville remains a dynamic economic center within the Fifth District of North Carolina.

More than 40 companies were represented at last week's job fair. About 500 jobs were available, spanning a broad range of skills, abilities, and compensation levels. The organizers offered a resume workshop to help applicants make a first good impression.

I would like to take a few minutes to recognize just a few of those who helped make this event a success and who spend every day making the economy and community of Statesville run.

Gina Shumaker is a graduate of the Mitchell Community College Back to Work program, and now she is giving back to her work with Workforce Carolina. Gina spends every day matching jobseekers with opportunities. She was at the job fair looking to fill 197 positions, and I commend her efforts to help individuals get back on their feet.

Goodyear; I also had the opportunity to talk with Joe Wegmiller, who is the plant manager for the Goodyear manufacturing plant in Statesville. This facility has been manufacturing tire molds in Statesville since 1995. I have had the opportunity to tour the facility, and it is a key employer in the Fifth District.

Doosan; Doosan Portable Power specializes in making generators, air compressors, and other light construction equipment. This company is headquartered in Statesville and brings more than 100 years of manufacturing

experience to bear on the task of providing quality equipment for construction and other industrial uses. We are proud that they call Statesville home and grateful for the opportunities they provide to members of our community.

ASMO in North Carolina employs more than 350 people in Statesville. This company produces blower motors, power seat motors, power window motors, electric power steering motors, and other assemblies for auto manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, at last week's job fair, a common refrain among employers is that they have had a hard time finding individuals with the skills needed to fill available positions. This reminded me of H.R. 803, the SKILLS Act. This bill would reform and reorganize our broken Federal workforce development system.

There is bipartisan agreement that the current Federal workforce development programs are not meeting the needs of America's jobseekers, many of whom were in attendance at the Statesville job fair last week.

In his 2012 State of the Union address, the President asked that these programs be reformed, and Republicans in the House went to work and passed the SKILLS Act, which would streamline 35 ineffective and duplicative programs, including 26 identified as being ineffective in a 2011 GAO report.

The SKILLS Act empowers job creators, such as Goodyear, Doosan, ASMO, and many others that were looking to hire in Statesville last week. The SKILLS Act would allow local businesses to help steer workforce development resources toward fields that are in demand right now. This bill passed the House over a year ago. I call on our colleagues over in the Senate to act on this vital piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this House will maintain its focus on creating an environment conducive to economic growth and job creation. We have passed more

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2567

than 30 pieces of legislation designed to decrease the bureaucracy, increase opportunity, and restore vitality to our economy. Unfortunately, the majority of this legislation is languishing in the Senate. The employers, jobseekers, and community members I spoke with last week in Statesville want to move forward with their businesses and lives. There are House-passed bills that will help solve some of the problems they are facing. The Senate and the President need to act to turn these bills into law.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

In this Chamber, where the people's House gathers, we pause to offer You gratitude for the gift of this good land on which we live, and for this great Nation which You have inspired in developing over so many years. Continue to inspire the American people, that through the difficulties of these days we might keep liberty and justice alive in our Nation and in the world.

Give to us and all people a vivid sense of Your presence, that we may learn to understand each other, to respect each other, to work with each other, to live with each other, and to do good to each other. So shall we make our Nation great in goodness and good in its greatness.

As the Members of this House return from a week of constituent visits, grant them wisdom and goodwill as they address the issues of days to come.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr.

WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### FOUR YEARS AFTER OBAMACARE, AMERICANS ARE WORSE OFF

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this is the Affordable Care Act. Yesterday marks the 4-year anniversary of when it was signed into law. We all knew, at least on the Republican side of this House, how this thing was troubled when it was passed 4 years ago, but what no one could have predicted was the aggressive incompetence of the administration and the agencies during the implementation.

It is hurting average Americans. I get comments from people back home on my Facebook page literally every day. People tell me their stories of their health care plans being canceled, their premiums and deductibles going up, and trusted access to family doctors being lost.

Rosie told me her premiums went up 62 percent last year. Heidi's husband lost his job because his company was forced to downsize because of the law. Kim told me her family's premium has gone up, resulting in over \$9,000 a year now out-of-pocket, in addition to what they paid last year.

One person put it best, saying: This Affordable Care Act is simply not affordable. Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve better.

#### FOUR YEARS LATER AND OBAMACARE IS STILL FAILING

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, for the last 4 years, American families have watched as ObamaCare has destroyed jobs, increased insurance premiums, and denied access to trusted medical professionals. You can't keep your doctor.

From day one, the administration has not been honest with the law's effectiveness or its implementation. This unworkable, irresponsible law continues to plague families. We must work together to repeal and replace ObamaCare.

House Republicans know that commonsense solutions exist which will provide relief to those who have fallen victims to the President's countless broken promises. Unfortunately, the administration and Senate Democrats have refused to work with us to make changes and restore health care decisions back to the American people, not to Big Government.

As the open enrollment period deadline approaches leading to more hardship for families, medical professionals, and small businesses, it is our duty to work together to change ObamaCare, which destroys jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

#### GET THE GOVERNMENT OUT OF THE WAY OF JOB CREATORS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, tonight the Statesville Chamber of Commerce will host its annual dinner and recognize the individuals, businesses, and nonprofits that help make Statesville, North Carolina, thrive.

Unfortunately, our work here will keep me from joining them. As we recognize the great work local organizations like the Statesville Chamber do to help local businesses compete, we should remain focused on the task of keeping Washington out of their way.

We have passed numerous bills in the House to cut through bureaucracy and get the government out of the way of job creators.

In the last week of February, the House passed one such bill: the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act. UMITA would require new Federal rules and regulations to undergo more complete and accurate cost analyses.

With regulations estimated to impose over 87 million hours of paperwork on American businesses, I hope this bill passes the Senate with the same bipartisan support it received in the House.

#### HONORING JIM SPEARS, DANIEL LETOURNEAU, AND DWAYNE DAVIDSON

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of heroes in society. They include moms and dads, doctors, nurses, and teachers, and those who go above and beyond to help others at great risk to themselves.

I want to recognize three examples of such bravery today: Jim Spears, Daniel Letourneau, and Dwayne Davidson—all UPS employees—who risked their lives to help a stranger whose van had flipped multiple times on an icy highway outside of Indianapolis.

The victim was stuck in her vehicle, and their selfless actions kept her from further harm. The beneficiary of their selfless acts said: "The goodness of people in this world is so great . . . and there are truly great people out there who we should appreciate." Well said.

Last week I had the opportunity to meet Jim, David, and Dwayne. Today, I want to commend them for their bravery and thank them for reminding us what it truly means to be a hero.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

CORPORAL JUSTIN D. ROSS POST  
OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1228) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 300 Packerland Drive in Green Bay, Wisconsin, as the "Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building", as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1228

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. CORPORAL JUSTIN D. ROSS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 South 9th Street in De Pere, Wisconsin, shall be known and designated as the "Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be given 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

H.R. 1228, introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE), would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service, located at 123 South 9th Street, in DePere, Wisconsin, as the Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building.

Army Specialist Justin Ross was killed in action while serving in Operation Enduring Freedom. Assigned to the 863rd Engineer Battalion, Army Reserve, Wausau, Wisconsin, he died on March 26 in Afghanistan. Justin was posthumously honored and promoted to corporal.

Corporal Ross was wounded when his unit came under small arms fire from insurgents while on a route clearance mission. He was the only casualty and the first of the unit. Only 22 at the time of his death, Corporal Ross was posthumously awarded the Bronze Star, Purple Heart, and meritorious service medals.

Corporal Ross was a 2007 graduate of Bay Port High School and joined the military in October of 2007. Those close to him understood that serving in the Army was a lifelong dream of Justin's. His parents knew that he loved being part of the mission in Afghanistan.

His unit had high praise for their fallen brother. They said he was an outstanding soldier that loved being in the Army and loved working with his fellow soldiers. He will be remembered by his family, friends, church, community, and fellow soldiers as a wonderful man who was proud to serve his country.

Madam Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to stand before this body today and honor the memory of a true American hero. I am grateful for the service of Corporal Ross and for all those who serve and protect us each and every day. I urge all Members to join me in strong support of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 1228, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 300 Packerland Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin, as the Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building.

The measure before us was introduced on March 15, 2013, by my colleague, Representative REID RIBBLE of Wisconsin.

In accordance to committee requirements, the bill before us is cosponsored by all members of the Wisconsin delegation. H.R. 1228 was reported out of House Oversight and Government Reform Committee by unanimous consent on March 12, 2014.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to just thank the Ross family for their son giving the ultimate sacrifice in serving this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE), my friend and colleague.

Mr. RIBBLE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Texas. I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri for letting me come down here, for recognizing the sacrifice of a family from Green Bay, Wisconsin.

This is always a difficult time. I can hear the emotions of the voices of my colleagues as they speak about Justin and about Corporal Ross and his family and the sacrifice.

I have to tell you, Madam Speaker, there is probably nothing more difficult to do than to try to craft some speech, some words, some language here today that would honor Corporal Ross and his family in a way that is sufficient to the sacrifice that this family had.

You have already heard a little bit about Corporal Justin David Ross. He was born on September 14, 1988, and served in the Army Reserve. He was a member of the 863rd Engineer Battalion in Wausau, Wisconsin.

Tragically, he was killed on March 26, 2011. The anniversary of his death, Madam Speaker, is just 2 days from now. That will be 3 years since this family lost their son and this country lost its hero.

Corporal Ross was the first servicemember from the 8th Congressional District of Wisconsin killed in the line of duty after I began my first term in Congress in 2011. I was sworn in, in January of 2011, and 90 days later, Justin was killed.

He served his country honorably. He earned numerous awards for his service, including the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star and nine other meritorious service awards.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform passed this bill by a voice vote without any objection. It is also, as was mentioned by the gentleman from Missouri, supported by virtually every member of the Wisconsin House delegation.

So how do we go about honoring Justin Ross? How do we go about honoring his mom and dad, Ron and Debbie? How do we honor his brothers?

It is almost impossible to do so because we have a tendency to almost falsely believe that Justin was about a chevron on a sleeve, a medal on his chest, or a service ribbon that he wore on his uniform.

Those are the things that Justin did and the accomplishments that Justin had. They weren't really who Justin was. Justin did serve as a soldier in the Army, and he did die in the line of duty on behalf of his country, but he was more than that.

Imagine a family back in 1988 welcoming their son to this Earth and picking him up and cradling him in their arms, not knowing that they were cradling a hero. They couldn't possibly

have known 22 years ago what would happen to their son. I thank them for their sacrifice. This means a lot to our country. It means a lot to this family.

I am sorry I get choked up, but this matters to us. It matters to our country. The loss that was there is significant, every single one. I knew Justin. His dad was a pastor. His grandfather was a pastor.

He lived under the teachings of those two men who taught him in the book of Thessalonians to lead a quiet life. He did that. If you listen to the way his friends and his family talked about him, they often mention how quiet, almost shy that Justin was. He did that.

He followed the teachings of the apostle Paul. When the apostle Paul told us that no greater love is this than to lay down a life for a friend, not only did he lay down his life for his friends and his comrades, he was doing a clearance mission.

Madam Speaker, he was going in front of our troops, clearing out IEDs and making the way safe. He gave his life so others didn't have to. He gave his life for people that he loved. There was no greater love than this, as we are taught by the apostle Paul.

Jesus himself said to love your neighbor as yourself, and Justin did just that. All through his life, he lived by the teachings of his faith; but what his grandfather taught him, what his dad taught him, what his mom taught him, he lived those values out every single day.

Now, I know that Justin would want one thing because Justin cared a lot about his comrades. He would be embarrassed to think that we were naming this post office in his name alone. There were four other soldiers that were killed in the 8th District of Wisconsin.

I want to remember them today as well because it is about them, too. Sergeant Paul Atim from Green Bay; Staff Sergeant Matthew Hermanson from Appleton; Staff Sergeant Eppinger from Appleton; and Staff Sergeant Bear from Elton, Wisconsin, all of these soldiers gave their lives on behalf of this country. Their brave and selfless service deserves to be remembered.

So what do we do? We take the time, and we say thank you, and then we blazon Justin's name on a post office, so that when the citizens of De Pere, Wisconsin, go into that post office, they see their hero's name and remember. That is what we should do today.

I thank my colleagues for supporting this bill.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I too am prepared to close.

I want to urge the passage of H.R. 1228, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am moved by Mr. RIBBLE's speech. I am moved by the sacrifices that men

and women make every day serving this country. I do think nothing could be more appropriate than honoring the memory of Corporal Justin D. Ross by naming the post office building in De Pere, Wisconsin, after him.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting for this bill, H.R. 1228, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1228, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### SERGEANT WILLIAM MOODY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3060) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 232 Southwest Johnson Avenue in Burleson, Texas, as the "Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3060

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SERGEANT WILLIAM MOODY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 232 Southwest Johnson Avenue in Burleson, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3060, introduced by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. ROGER WILLIAMS, would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 232 Southwest Johnson Avenue in Burleson, Texas, as the Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building.

As a fellow Texan, I am proud to join my colleague, Mr. WILLIAMS, in urging this body to name this postal facility in honor of Sergeant William Moody.

□ 1615

Sergeant Moody went above and beyond the call of duty, serving in both the U.S. Army and the U.S. Marine Corps. He served two tours of duty in Iraq while he was a marine, and he was finishing his second and last tour of duty in Afghanistan with the Army when a Taliban rocket attack on Bagram Air Force Base took his life on June 18 of 2013. William Moody was a 30-year-old husband and father of three.

Madam Speaker, I was particularly touched to read about the special homecoming surprise that Sergeant Moody had in store for his family. While deployed in Afghanistan, he contacted the fire department in Burleson and asked if he could surprise his children by picking them up from school in a fire truck on the day of his return. Of course, the chief and the firefighters responded with a resounding "yes" to this request, and they exchanged emails with Sergeant Moody, making plans for his return up until the afternoon of the day before his death. Even in the midst of a war zone, Sergeant Moody's thoughts and hopes were back home in Texas, with his wife and children, demonstrating his deep dedication to family. His example and his love of his family should move, touch, and inspire all of us, and it should be an example that we should all follow.

Sergeant Moody was a highly decorated soldier and marine. Among his honors were an Army Commendation Medal, a Combat Action Ribbon, an Army Good Conduct Medal, a Marine Corps Good Conduct Medal, a Bronze Star, and a Purple Heart, just to name a few.

Madam Speaker, it is an honor to pay tribute before this body to a fellow Texan who gave his life in the defense of our country. I am grateful to Sergeant William Moody for his service, and I urge all Members to join me in the strong support of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 3060, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 232 Southwest Johnson Avenue, in Burleson, Texas, as the Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building.

This measure before us was introduced on August 2, 2013, by my colleague, Representative ROGER WILLIAMS of Texas. In accordance with

committee requirements, the bill is cosponsored by all members of the Texas delegation. H.R. 3060 was reported out of the committee by unanimous consent on March 12, 2014.

Let me say that Sergeant Moody lived a remarkable life, and he served his country in two capacities: first, as a U.S. marine and, second, as a sergeant in the Army. Madam Speaker, I ask that we pass this bill without reservation in order to recognize the service, valor, and life of Sergeant William Moody.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), my good friend, colleague, and fellow Texan.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you to my colleagues for being here today.

Madam Speaker, on June 17, 2013, decorated Army Sergeant William Moody of Burleson, Texas, while he was serving his second tour of duty in Afghanistan, sent an email to the local fire chief in his hometown. He wanted to plan a special "coming home" surprise with the help of the fire department and pull up to his kids' school in a big fire engine. He was set to return sometime in September, but on the following day of June 18, Sergeant Moody and three other American soldiers were killed by indirect enemy fire at Bagram Air Force Base.

Sergeant Moody is truly a hometown hero.

Born and raised in Burleson, Texas, Sergeant Moody joined the Marines after graduating from Burleson High School. He served two tours of duty in Iraq and later joined the Army, where he deployed twice to Afghanistan. Throughout his years of service, Sergeant Moody's commendable service earned him numerous honors and service medals, including the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, a Bronze Star, and a Purple Heart.

Thanks to the city of Burleson and with the leadership of Mayor Ken Shetter and the Burleson City Council, today marks a huge victory in our joint efforts to pay tribute to Sergeant Moody's service and sacrifice by dedicating the Burleson Post Office facility in honor of this hometown hero.

Later today, the House will vote on a bill I was proud to introduce, H.R. 3060, to officially name the local post office facility after Sergeant Moody. Along with hundreds of my colleagues in Congress, it will be one of the greatest honors of my life to support this bill. Not only will the Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building serve as a memorial for his wife and three children to cherish, but it will honor all of our Nation's veterans and will stand as a reminder of the true price of our freedom.

The war on terror is far from over. There are countless attempts by hostile groups to do us harm and bring destruction. That is why it is important to recognize the memory of our Na-

tion's heroes. In the words of Ronald Reagan: Freedom is never more than a generation away from extinction; it must be fought for and defended by each new generation.

I hope that future generations will be inspired to live and serve like Sergeant William Moody. He fought with courage, served with integrity, and will be remembered forever. America does not give because it is rich; America is rich because it gives—and we are all proud that it gave us Sergeant William Moody.

May God bless our troops; may God bless Texas; and may God bless the United States of America.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 3060.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I join with all of my Texas colleagues and especially with Mr. WILLIAMS in urging that we do honor Sergeant William Moody by renaming the postal facility in Burleson in his honor. I join in the remarks that Mr. WILLIAMS made about the necessity to pay honor and tribute to those who make the ultimate sacrifice to this country, and I agree that naming the post office will actually serve as a memorial that, perhaps, will ease the pain of the loss of Sergeant William Moody's family. So I urge all Members to join me in supporting H.R. 3060.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3060.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### STAFF SERGEANT NICHOLAS J. REID POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1451) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1451

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. STAFF SERGEANT NICHOLAS J. REID POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1451, introduced by the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building. H.R. 1451 is cosponsored by the entire New York delegation.

Army Staff Sergeant Reid was born in Brockport on April 2, 1986. He graduated from Brockport High School in 2004 and enlisted in the Army thereafter in 2006. He was serving his second tour of duty in Afghanistan when insurgents attacked his unit with an improvised explosive device. He tragically succumbed to his wounds in Germany on December 13, 2012. He was only 26 years old. He leaves behind his loving parents, Ken and Dorothy Reid; his sister, Susie; and several aunts, uncles, cousins, and friends.

Madam Speaker, Nicholas, who went by "Nick," enlisted as an explosive ordnance disposal technician. He knew the dangers of IEDs. He knew how many of our troops had been killed by these devices, how many had been wounded. Yet he chose this hazardous duty and excelled at it, and he showed great courage. Nick Reid is a true hero. It is my privilege to urge the strong support for this bill to honor his memory.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, at this point, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from that beautiful district in upstate New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), our ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. It is, indeed, beautiful. It snows all the time, though, and we have had about enough.

Madam Speaker, as the previous speakers have said, on April 2, 1986, the Reid family of Brockport, New York, gave birth to a son named Nicholas. For 26 years, Nicholas lived a life of honor and duty; and though he was

taken from this Earth far too soon, his was a life that should be remembered throughout our time.

Just 2 years out of high school, Nicholas signed up for the United States Army while we were in the midst of two wars. Surely knowing that he would see the dangers of battle but proudly volunteering to serve his country, Nicholas was assigned to the 53rd Ordnance Company of the 3rd Ordnance Battalion based at Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Washington State.

Nicholas served two tours of duty on the battlefields of Afghanistan and faced some of the most dangerous situations ever encountered by the United States Army as an explosive ordnance disposal specialist, the most dangerous job there was. In his frontline role, Nicholas repeatedly risked his life for the safety of his fellow soldiers and civilians alike.

It was in this role that Nicholas suffered fatal injuries when an improvised explosive device detonated in Sperwan village, Afghanistan, on December 9, 2012. Seventeen days later, the town of Brockport honored Nicholas' heroic life when his body returned home. "We are here to make sure he receives the welcome home that he deserves," said one community member who stood in the cold winter wind and under gray skies to welcome Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid home.

Today, I rise to make permanent the debt of gratitude our Nation owes to Staff Sergeant Reid and to his parents, Ken and Dorothy. With this legislation, the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, will be permanently designated as the Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building.

A recipient of the Bronze Star and Purple Heart, among countless other medals of service, we can never fully repay Nicholas or his family for their service to our country; but with this gesture, we can ensure that future generations will know of the incredible life that Staff Sergeant Reid lived, of his honor, his sacrifice, and pride in serving his hometown of Brockport and the country that he defended. It is with immeasurable gratitude that I offer this legislation today and remember Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, we are prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I would just ask that we pass this bill without reservation in order to recognize the sacrifice that Nicholas J. Reid, his family, and loved ones have made for the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid deserves the post office in Brockport to be named after him, so I urge all Members to join me in voting for the passage of this bill to honor Nick.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1451.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1630

#### JUDGE SHIRLEY A. TOLENTINO POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1376) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, as the "Judge Shirley A. Tolentino Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1376

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. JUDGE SHIRLEY A. TOLENTINO POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, shall be known and designated as the "Judge Shirley A. Tolentino Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Judge Shirley A. Tolentino Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1376, introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, as the Judge Shirley A. Tolentino Post Office Building.

Judge Tolentino was a remarkable woman, and her life was marked by several accomplishments. Judge Tolentino was born in Jersey City and graduated from Henry Snyder High School as an honor student. She attended the College of St. Elizabeth's

and Seton Hall University School of Law, where she was the only African American in her class when she received her juris doctor degree in 1971. Judge Tolentino also went on to receive a specialized master of laws degree in criminal justice from New York University Graduate School of Law in 1980.

Judge Tolentino was appointed to the Superior Court of the State of New Jersey on January 11, 1984. She was the first female appointed to that position. She had previously been appointed as the first female to the Jersey City Municipal Court in 1976. In 1981, she became the first female presiding judge of the Jersey City Municipal Court.

One of her proudest accomplishments was serving on the Coleman Commission, which later became the New Jersey Supreme Court Task Force on Minorities, as well as chairing the Commission on Criminal Justice and Minority Defendants and serving on the Committee on Criminal Practice.

In addition to her fine public service, Judge Tolentino was a leader in many service-oriented organizations, including the Urban League, Girl Scouts, and the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority. She also served on the boards of various academic institutions, including her alma mater, St. Elizabeth's.

Unfortunately, Judge Tolentino passed away at the age of 67 on October 31, 2010. She is survived by her husband, Dr. Ernesto Tolentino, two daughters, and many beloved family members and friends. She was a pillar of her community and a strong role model for women and men of all ages.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1376, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Texas for giving me this opportunity to speak on a true hero in our community.

In New Jersey, Ms. Tolentino is someone that is looked to with great esteem. She led the way on many issues moving women and minorities forward and showing that they had a rightful place at the table of power, the ability to serve, and the distinction to lead.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1376, to name the postal facility located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, after the late Honorable Shirley A. Tolentino.

Shirley Tolentino was born in Jersey City, served as a distinguished jurist in Hudson County for over 26 years, and was a trailblazer for women and African Americans as public servants in New Jersey. She was a product of the local public school system in Jersey City, where she was an honor student, graduating from Snyder High School. She then earned a scholarship to attend the College of St. Elizabeth in Morristown, New Jersey, graduating with a degree in Latin with honors.



To put herself through law school, Judge Tolentino worked as a high school Latin and English teacher while attending Seton Hall University School of Law, graduating as the only African American female in the class of 1971.

After law school, she became a deputy attorney general in the State of New Jersey, where she remained until she rose to the bench in Jersey City in 1976. She became the second African American woman to be named as a municipal court judge in New Jersey, and the first to be appointed to the Jersey City Municipal Court.

In 1980, Judge Tolentino earned her master of laws degree in criminal justice from NYU Graduate School of Law, while continuing to serve in the municipal court. In 1981, she continued to blaze a trail for others, becoming the first African American presiding judge of Jersey City Municipal Court. Her successes didn't stop there. In 1984, when she was appointed by Governor Thomas Kean, Judge Tolentino became the first African American woman to ascend to the Superior Court of the State of New Jersey.

Later, she was appointed to the original Coleman Commission, which would later be called the New Jersey Supreme Court Task Force on Minorities. During her time on the Commission, she became the chair of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Justice, and also served as a Supreme Court chair of the Committee on Criminal Justice and Minority Defendants. With all her professional achievements, she viewed her appointment and time served on the Commission as her greatest accomplishment.

Over the years, Judge Tolentino's career was highlighted by many firsts, and she accomplished much during her years on and off the bench. As a member of the Jersey City Hudson County Urban League, the Hudson County Girl Scouts board, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Hudson County CYO, the Visiting Homemakers of Hudson County board, and a host of other local organizations, she was an integral part of her community.

Throughout her success, Judge Tolentino always called Jersey City home and actively participated in community service in the city that bore and raised her.

Judge Shirley Tolentino passed away on October 31, 2010, and is survived by her husband, Dr. Ernesto Tolentino, children, and grandchildren.

It is not a coincidence that the post office to bear her name would be located on Martin Luther King Jr. Drive. There is no better way to honor the achievements of Judge Tolentino and at the same time provide a permanent monument of possibilities and hope for young women, African Americans, and the citizens of Jersey City.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill in honor of her legacy.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I urge the passage of H.R. 1376, to commemorate the life of Judge Tolentino and all of her accomplishments and service to the Jersey City community.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I join with my friends and colleagues across the aisle, Mr. PAYNE and Mr. CLAY, in urging passage of H.R. 1376, designating the postal facility in New Jersey to be named after Judge Tolentino, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1376.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LANCE CORPORAL DANIEL NATHAN DEYARMIN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1813) to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 162 Northeast Avenue in Tallmadge, Ohio, as the "Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin Post Office Building", as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1813

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. LANCE CORPORAL DANIEL NATHAN DEYARMIN, JR., POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 162 Northeast Avenue in Tallmadge, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the "Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin, Jr., Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin, Jr., Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1813 was introduced by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and would redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 162 Northeast Avenue in Tallmadge, Ohio, as the Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin Post Office Building.

Marine Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin, Jr., who went by "Nathan," was born on July 30, 1983, in Akron, Ohio. His family moved to Tallmadge when he was just a year and a half old, and Nathan grew up there. He was a 2002 graduate of Tallmadge High School.

Nathan joined the Marines in 2003, and served with Weapons Company, 3rd Battalion, 25th Marine Regiment, 4th Marine Division. In March of 2005, Nathan was deployed to Iraq. Sadly, just 5 months later, he was killed on August 1 by enemy small arms fire while conducting dismounted operations outside Haditha. Five other marines died at his side.

Madam Speaker, Representative RYAN's staff shared with me that when Nathan was asked why he wanted to join the military, he said that he "wanted a brother" and that he "wanted to become a respectable, responsible, productive American." He certainly achieved all of those goals.

In the eyes of his family, friends, fellow marines, countrymen, and those of us standing here today to honor his tremendous sacrifice, he is one of the most respected Americans this body has had the great privilege of honoring. Those brave men and women who put themselves in harm's way to defend our safety and freedom deserve our honor, respect, and heartfelt gratitude.

I ask my colleagues for their strong support of H.R. 1813, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Texas for his kind words as well.

Madam Speaker, from the Book of Isaiah, chapter 6, verse 8:

Then I heard the voice of the Lord saying, Whom shall I send? And I said, Here I am. Send me.

Nate said, Send me, when his country asked and he was looking for a way to serve. He joined the Marine Corps.

Lance Corporal Deyarmin was born on July 30, 1983. He was named after his father, but they started calling him "Nate." They moved to Tallmadge, in our congressional district, when he was 1½ years old. He lived there his whole life. His family said he was a homeboy from Tallmadge. Nate went to school there and played sports there. He lived there and he made friends there.

Nate joined the Marine Corps as his way of serving, but when you read about his life, the interesting thing—and what we are celebrating here—is

that he said, Send me, from the very early stages of his life here on Earth.

When his great grandfather was 89 years old and bedridden, it was little Nate that jumped into the bed and started playing Legos to engage his great grandfather to make him feel better. They had this little game they would play where his grandfather would move his false teeth in and out of his mouth and little Nate would try and grab the teeth. A few years later, when the great grandfather died, Nate had an opportunity to pick whatever he wanted of his great grandfather's—and he picked the false teeth.

I think that is the kind of spirit that Nate brought to his family, friends, the Marine Corps, and to our country.

While driving down the road on his way to school, if there happened to be someone walking to school who didn't have a driver's license, Nate was the kind of guy that stopped and picked that person up and took them to school.

□ 1645

Nate said: Send me.

If someone was bullying someone at school and Nate was there, Nate was the guy who got in the middle of it and made sure that no one was bullied. He said: Send me.

If a family was having trouble, Nate would stop by the house, make sure everything was going okay. Nate said: Send me.

So now, those of us who drive by this post office in Tallmadge, Ohio, we will look up, we will see Nate's name, and we will not only remember his name or his service, but how his life challenges all of us in some way, shape, or form, in every little interaction, to say and answer the call when we are asked: Send me.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, we are prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Ohio for bringing this bill forward. I ask that we pass the underlying bill, without reservation, to honor Lance Corporal Deyarmin and his steadfast dedication to this country.

I urge the passage of H.R. 1813, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I urge this body to join the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and me in supporting H.R. 1813, renaming the United States Postal Service facility at 162 Northeast Avenue in Tallmadge, Ohio, to honor Nate, naming it as the Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin, Jr., Post Office Building.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1813, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### NATIONAL PARK RANGER MARGARET ANDERSON POST OFFICE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1036) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Center Street West in Eatonville, Washington, as the "National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1036

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. NATIONAL PARK RANGER MARGARET ANDERSON POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Center Street West in Eatonville, Washington, shall be known and designated as the "National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, once again, it is my honor to be up here speaking about a bill, this one, H.R. 1036, introduced by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Center Street West in Eatonville, Washington, as the National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office.

Mount Rainier National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson was fatally shot in the line of duty on January 1 of 2012. On the morning of January 1, at approximately 10:30 in the morning, Ranger Anderson was at Paradise, the park's most popular winter destination, when she responded to a radio call while she was welcoming visitors.

The radio call asked her to set up a traffic block to intercept a vehicle that failed to stop at a chained-up checkpoint in the park. The driver of the vehicle opened fire on Ranger Anderson and then fled on foot into the woods.

Unbeknownst to Ranger Anderson, the suspect was wanted in connection with a shooting the previous day in which four people were wounded.

Ms. Anderson was an exceptional park ranger who served the National Park Service for 12 years and worked at Mount Rainier for 3 years. She is survived by her husband, Eric, who is also a Mount Rainier park ranger, and two children, Annalise and Kathryn.

Margaret was only 34 years old at the time of her death. Ranger Anderson gave her life protecting park visitors and staff from a dangerous criminal. Paradise is a magnet for sledders, skiers, and families with small children, and at least 100 people had already arrived at the park on this day when Ranger Anderson was shot.

Margaret's brave action very possibly saved many lives that day, and she is to be commended and remembered as a hero.

I urge all Members to join me in strong support of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 1036, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 103 Center Street West in Eatonville, Washington, as the National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office.

This measure before us was introduced on March 7, 2013, by my colleague, Representative David Reichert. In accordance with committee requirements, the bill is cosponsored by all members of the Washington delegation. H.R. 1036 was reported out of committee by unanimous consent on March 12, 2014.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from the State of Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think most of the Members here know that I had a 33-year career in law enforcement prior to coming to the House of Representatives a little over 9 years ago. During that time, I lost good friends and partners in the line of duty—shot, stabbed—and they left behind families, husbands and wives and children. Those are memories that stick with me—and I know the friends and partners I have in law enforcement—forever, and the families never forget and never recover.

On this day that has been mentioned by my colleague—on New Year's Day, in the year 2012, Park Ranger Margaret Anderson responded to a call. Her job



usually is to guide folks through the park and show them the scenery and talk about the trailways and the flowers and the trees that are growing on Mount Rainier, educate the young children.

But all of a sudden, she is called to duty, to switch gears, to put her life on the line. She showed up that day to block the road from this dangerous criminal who had already committed crimes in Seattle and was on the loose. There was a manhunt that was conducted trying to find this person before he hurt or injured or killed anyone else.

Margaret Anderson served Mount Rainier Park for about 4 years. She was a National Park Ranger for 12 years. Her husband was serving with her on that very same day. He heard the call go out—officer down—and then realized it was his wife.

We go about our days here in Congress, and we sometimes forget the men and women who guard this Capitol, who guard our lives each and every day; and when we go home, those men and women in uniform are there protecting our families and our communities.

Sometimes, Madam Speaker, they lose their life. Sometimes, they put their life on the line, and sometimes, they don't come home.

In this case, Margaret Anderson did not come home. She left her husband and her two children to grieve, but she saved lives that day. That is what we do.

It is an honor for me to be here today with this piece of legislation, H.R. 1036, that honors a brave resident of Eatonville, Washington. It is a little town nestled right at the foot of Mount Rainier, with only 3,000 people, so to name a post office after her, I think, would be a great honor, a great memorial.

It is one of the things that we can do, so that we can say we will never forget.

Thank you, Margaret, for your service.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to thank my colleague from Washington State for bringing this bill.

I ask that we pass this bill, without reservation, to recognize Margaret Anderson and her dedication to her family, the United States Park Service, and for paying the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty, to ensure the safety and security of her fellow citizens.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I look to my colleagues here in the House of Representatives and say please join Mr. REICHERT, Mr. CLAY, the entire Washington delegation, and me in voting to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 103 Center Street West in Eatonville, Washington, to honor a hero who gave her life protecting park patrons, to name that post office the National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office.

Please join me in voting “yea” on this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1036.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PHILIPPINES CHARITABLE GIVING ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3771) to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3771

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Philippines Charitable Giving Assistance Act”.

#### SEC. 2. ACCELERATION OF INCOME TAX BENEFITS FOR CHARITABLE CASH CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RELIEF OF VICTIMS OF TYPHOON HAIYAN IN THE PHILIPPINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, a taxpayer may treat any contribution described in subsection (b) made after the date of the enactment of this Act, and before April 15, 2014, as if such contribution was made on December 31, 2013, and not in 2014.

(b) CONTRIBUTION DESCRIBED.—A contribution is described in this subsection if such contribution is a cash contribution made for the relief of victims in areas affected by Typhoon Haiyan, for which a charitable contribution deduction is allowable under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) RECORDKEEPING.—In the case of a contribution described in subsection (b), a telephone bill showing the name of the donee organization, the date of the contribution, and the amount of the contribution shall be treated as meeting the recordkeeping requirements of section 170(f)(17) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I applaud the efforts of my colleagues. This is a common-sense way of doing things, and I don't think that many Americans realize the total devastation that Haiyan caused when it hit the Philippines, when you look at the loss of life, when you look at the number of displaced people, when you look at how many people it totally affected.

Now, when it comes to loss of life, we are talking about 6,200 people killed by this storm, 4.1 million displaced; and it affected over 14.1 million people.

The purpose of this legislation is kind of common sense. It allows people up to April 15 to go ahead and make a contribution to try and stem the effects of those losses. It just makes sense. It is something we have always done as Americans.

When we look at the special relationship we have with the Philippines, I don't think we can really look too far beyond where our history has been together as a people to understand that, when times get tough, when things happen to other folks, and when we can step in and help them, that we always do. It is just who we are. It is unique to America.

So I thank the gentleman for bringing it forward. I think it makes sense to all of us. This is truly bipartisan.

At a time when most people think that this House of Representatives can't do things that are bipartisan and doesn't act in the best for all people concerned, I think this surely does show that, by allowing Americans up until April 15 of this year to be able to make a contribution to help ease the devastation in the Philippines and still be able to use taxes from 2013. That is unique, and that is something I think we should do.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3771. This bill allows taxpayers to treat charitable contributions in support of Typhoon Haiyan recovery efforts in the Philippines made between the date of enactment of this bill and April 15, 2014, as if they were made in the 2013 tax year.

□ 1700

More than 4 months ago, on November 8, Typhoon Haiyan struck the Philippines, killing 6,000 people, destroying more than 1 million homes, displacing 4 million people, and affecting 16 million people.

Following this disaster, there was an outpouring of support for the people of the Philippines and from people around our country, including a number of folks in my district, particularly members of the Filipino American community, like Norma Placido, president of the Filipino Community of Solano

County, and members of the Filipino American Chamber of Solano County. Many of my constituents have family members in the Philippines that were affected by this typhoon, and they are trying to do everything possible to help them rebuild.

The United Nations-developed Strategic Response Plan, to coordinate and prioritize assistance, estimates that \$788 million will be needed for humanitarian aid through November 2014. Sadly, only \$369 million has been contributed to date. This bipartisan legislation, which I am proud to be part of with my colleague, Mr. SWALWELL, from California, Representative HECK from Nevada, and Representative ISSA from California will allow people to deduct qualifying charitable contributions made after the date of enactment of this bill and before the 15th of April on their 2013 tax returns. This will help incentivize charitable giving to the Philippine rebuilding efforts while the need is so great. Identical legislation has already been introduced and was passed unanimously by the Senate earlier this year.

Our country's relationship with the Philippines runs very deep. In World War II, 57,000 military Philippine servicemembers and 900,000 Philippine civilians gave their lives in support of our Allied Forces. And the Manila American Cemetery holds 17,202 brave American and Filipino troops killed during World War II.

The Philippines sent 7,500 combat troops to the Korean war and 2,000 troops to the Vietnam war. They sent 200 medical personnel to assist in the gulf war, and 60 medics, engineers, and other troops to assist in the Iraq war. In the wake of Hurricane Katrina, they offered to send our country a 25-team member of aid workers, and the Philippines Red Cross donated money. And they are one of our closest allies in the war on terror.

When tragedy strikes around the world, Americans don't sit on the sidelines; we help. Our allies in the Philippines are still working on their long-term rebuilding effort, and this bipartisan legislation will make sure that our committees are able to provide the help our friends need for this important phase of rebuilding.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important piece of legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL), my friend and a great leader on this effort.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for leading the effort on your side of the aisle. Also, I would like to thank Congressman THOMPSON, my colleague from California, for helping move this

through the House. I want to thank Chairman CAMP, Ranking Member LEVIN, Majority Leader CANTOR, and Democratic Leader PELOSI for helping me get this important bill to the floor. Also, I thank the lead cosponsors, Congressman HECK, as well as Congressman ISSA, who joined Congressman THOMPSON and me in this effort, as well as Senator HIRONO in the Senate for doing the important work over there.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3771, the Philippines Charitable Giving Assistance Act, which would incentivize Americans to make charitable contributions to Typhoon Haiyan relief now.

Last November, Typhoon Haiyan was a storm of truly destructive power. With sustained winds of almost 200 miles per hour, it was the strongest storm ever to make landfall, resulting in the devastating effects that necessitate our action today.

Sadly, the results were catastrophic to the Philippines. According to that nation, 16 million people were affected, 4.1 million were displaced, and over 6,200 perished. Months after the disaster, help is still desperately needed. This includes a need for health care, food, clean water, and shelter.

The United Nations developed a Strategic Response Plan to coordinate and prioritize assistance from U.N. agencies, nongovernmental organizations, other international entities, and the Philippine Government. The U.N. has said \$788 million will be needed to accomplish the goals of the SRP through October 2014. Of that amount, only \$369 million has been provided so far.

Now, while I know Americans can and do help anyone in need, we have a special relationship, as my colleague from California pointed out, with the Philippines. Between 1898 and 1946, the Philippines was a part of the United States before becoming independent. There are today about 3.4 million Filipino Americans, including over 450,000 living in the San Francisco Bay area alone.

My San Francisco Bay area congressional district has a rich and vibrant Filipino community, from groups like Filipino Advocates for Justice to leaders like Father Geoffrey Baraan, my friend and the pastor at St. Anne Catholic Church in Union City, as well as Linda Canlas of the New Haven Unified School District in the East Bay.

Many of the Filipinos in my district, like many across the country, have friends or family still in the Philippines. That is why it is so important we do all we can to help.

The values of our country call for us to care for people across the world. More often than not, that includes people we will never see or ever meet, but no one is invisible. And after Typhoon Haiyan, people in my district are asking what they can do to help. H.R. 3771 empowers them to help.

As amended, it is a bipartisan bill that would provide a temporary incentive for Americans to contribute imme-

diately to typhoon relief efforts. It would allow certain monetary charitable contributions made after the date the bill is signed and before April 15, which is in just a few weeks, to be treated as if they were made in 2013.

Charitable contributions which qualify are monetary ones which are made to help persons in areas affected by Typhoon Haiyan and otherwise qualify as tax deductible donations. Qualifying contributions can thus be deducted on a person's 2013 taxes, which are covered by returns filed this year, as opposed to ones which are filed for the 2014 tax year.

By lowering a person's 2013 tax bill, which is due this year, the bill provides an incentive to act now for typhoon relief. This is important because the sooner that the aid comes and is provided, the sooner our friends in the Philippines can recover.

I should note that this is important in making a qualifying contribution. It doesn't matter if you have already filed your return this year.

I encourage all Members to support this bill. The Senate already cleared legislation with identical text in S. 1821. It also agreed that, if H.R. 3771 passed in the same form, the bill before us automatically would pass the Senate and go right to the President's desk.

When the bill is passed and signed into law, as I hope it will be, I further want to ask all Members and international aid organizations interested in Philippines relief to let people know about it as soon as possible. Time is of the essence. We will only have a few weeks for people to take advantage of this tax incentive, and we must do so so that we can continue to spread the word.

The people of the Philippines are not alone as they rebuild their lives and their beautiful country. H.R. 3771 allows Americans to play an important role in this effort, an effort that we should all care about.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3771, the Philippines Charitable Giving Assistance Act. As the Democratic co-chair of the U.S.-Philippines Friendship Caucus, I commend all of the sponsors of the bill who came together to support this legislation.

The United States and the Philippines have had a very close relationship for more than 100 years. The gentleman from California has outlined the support of the military, and the United States has been one of the Philippines' top trading partners and one of the largest foreign investors. Furthermore, there are over 3 million Americans of Filipino ancestry in the United States today.

In light of the close friendship that the United States and the Philippines enjoy, it is even more important that we rise to the occasion of supporting our friends in the Philippines as they continue to recover from Typhoon Haiyan.

Last November, the typhoon ravaged the Philippines' coast and was the strongest recorded storm ever to make landfall. Sixteen million people were affected, 4 million were displaced, and tens of thousands of lives were lost during the devastating storm.

While the response of both the United States and the international community has been strong and unified, more can obviously be done. The bill before us allows donations made to relief and recovery efforts directed at the Philippines to be deducted from one's income taxes when filing a 2013 return, rather than having to wait until 2014 to have the tax benefit from the donation. It is a simple measure that provides a small incentive to encourage Americans to continue to show their solidarity with those affected in the Philippines.

This bill is not unprecedented. Congress recently acted to provide a similar incentive after the earthquake in Haiti, which occurred in January 2010. The bill we are considering today, like the one passed after that earthquake, simply speeds up the process and encourages folks to donate now when the relief is most needed.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill so our friends in the Philippines will have all of the resources they need to continue during the path of recovery.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time. So at this time, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) for his help and persistence on this.

As we have already discussed, Typhoon Haiyan has been absolutely devastating. It hurt a tremendous number of people and has hurt communities. We really need to do everything we can to make sure that Americans can do what we do so well, and that is help our allies and our friends. This bill does that.

This bill, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out, is common sense. It has been done before. There is precedent. And this is a nation of our allies and our friends who are waiting for our help. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank both Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. SWALWELL so much for bringing this bill forward.

Again, I would just like to point out the uniqueness of the exceptional country that we live in. There is never a time that Americans don't always stand up. We are the first responders

anytime there is any kind of crisis or tragedy anywhere in the world.

I think it just points out uniquely how we are so exceptional in a world right now that seems to be torn apart and seems to be upside down in almost every measure, so to be able to be here today with you to take a look at our friends in the Philippines and understand the devastation that they have gone through and say we are just doing something, that makes sense. This is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue; it is simply an American issue. Once again, American hearts have always pulled together anytime people really needed us.

I don't know if people realize that the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) just arrived here, and it is a fete for him to be able to do this, to get this piece of legislation through.

So I strongly urge all of our colleagues to push forward on H.R. 3771. I just think it is unique for us at this time, especially, to get this done.

I yield back the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3771, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1715

#### COOPERATIVE AND SMALL EMPLOYER CHARITY PENSION FLEXIBILITY ACT

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4275) to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4275

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Cooperative and Small Employer Charity Pension Flexibility Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Congressional findings and declarations of policy.

Sec. 3. Effective date.

#### TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974 AND OTHER PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Definition of cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

Sec. 102. Funding rules applicable to cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

Sec. 103. Elections.

Sec. 104. Transparency.

Sec. 105. Sponsor education and assistance.

#### TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986

Sec. 201. Definition of cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

Sec. 202. Funding rules applicable to cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

Sec. 203. Election not to be treated as a CSEC plan.

#### SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) Defined benefit pension plans are a cost-effective way for cooperative associations and charities to provide their employees with economic security in retirement.

(2) Many cooperative associations and charitable organizations are only able to provide their employees with defined benefit pension plans because those organizations are able to pool their resources using the multiple employer plan structure.

(3) The pension funding rules should encourage cooperative associations and charities to continue to provide their employees with pension benefits.

#### SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Unless otherwise specified in this Act, the provisions of this Act shall apply to years beginning after December 31, 2013.

#### TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974 AND OTHER PROVISIONS

##### SEC. 101. DEFINITION OF COOPERATIVE AND SMALL EMPLOYER CHARITY PENSION PLANS.

Section 210 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1060) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) COOPERATIVE AND SMALL EMPLOYER CHARITY PENSION PLANS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this title, except as provided in this subsection, a CSEC plan is an employee pension benefit plan (other than a multiemployer plan) that is a defined benefit plan—

“(A) to which section 104 of the Pension Protection Act of 2006 applies, without regard to—

“(i) section 104(a)(2) of such Act;

“(ii) the amendments to such section 104 by section 202(b) of the Preservation of Access to Care for Medicare Beneficiaries and Pension Relief Act of 2010; and

“(iii) paragraph (3)(B); or

“(B) that, as of June 25, 2010, was maintained by more than one employer and all of the employers were organizations described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(2) AGGREGATION.—All employers that are treated as a single employer under subsection (b) or (c) of section 414 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be treated as a single employer for purposes of determining if a plan was maintained by more than one employer under paragraph (1)(B).”.

##### SEC. 102. FUNDING RULES APPLICABLE TO COOPERATIVE AND SMALL EMPLOYER CHARITY PENSION PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part 3 of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1081 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### “SEC. 306. MINIMUM FUNDING STANDARDS.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of section 302, the term ‘accumulated funding deficiency’ for a CSEC plan means the excess of the total charges to the funding standard account for all plan years (beginning with the first plan year to which section 302 applies) over the total credits to such account for

such years or, if less, the excess of the total charges to the alternative minimum funding standard account for such plan years over the total credits to such account for such years.

“(b) FUNDING STANDARD ACCOUNT.—

“(1) ACCOUNT REQUIRED.—Each plan to which this section applies shall establish and maintain a funding standard account. Such account shall be credited and charged solely as provided in this section.

“(2) CHARGES TO ACCOUNT.—For a plan year, the funding standard account shall be charged with the sum of—

“(A) the normal cost of the plan for the plan year,

“(B) the amounts necessary to amortize in equal annual installments (until fully amortized)—

“(i) in the case of a plan in existence on January 1, 1974, the unfunded past service liability under the plan on the first day of the first plan year to which section 302 applies, over a period of 40 plan years,

“(ii) in the case of a plan which comes into existence after January 1, 1974, but before the first day of the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2013, the unfunded past service liability under the plan on the first day of the first plan year to which section 302 applies, over a period of 30 plan years,

“(iii) separately, with respect to each plan year, the net increase (if any) in unfunded past service liability under the plan arising from plan amendments adopted in such year, over a period of 15 plan years,

“(iv) separately, with respect to each plan year, the net experience loss (if any) under the plan, over a period of 5 plan years, and

“(v) separately, with respect to each plan year, the net loss (if any) resulting from changes in actuarial assumptions used under the plan, over a period of 10 plan years,

“(C) the amount necessary to amortize each waived funding deficiency (within the meaning of section 302(c)(3)) for each prior plan year in equal annual installments (until fully amortized) over a period of 5 plan years,

“(D) the amount necessary to amortize in equal annual installments (until fully amortized) over a period of 5 plan years any amount credited to the funding standard account under paragraph (3)(D), and

“(E) the amount necessary to amortize in equal annual installments (until fully amortized) over a period of 20 years the contributions which would be required to be made under the plan but for the provisions of section 302(c)(7)(A)(i)(I) (as in effect on the day before the enactment of the Pension Protection Act of 2006).

“(3) CREDITS TO ACCOUNT.—For a plan year, the funding standard account shall be credited with the sum of—

“(A) the amount considered contributed by the employer to or under the plan for the plan year,

“(B) the amount necessary to amortize in equal annual installments (until fully amortized)—

“(i) separately, with respect to each plan year, the net decrease (if any) in unfunded past service liability under the plan arising from plan amendments adopted in such year, over a period of 15 plan years,

“(ii) separately, with respect to each plan year, the net experience gain (if any) under the plan, over a period of 5 plan years, and

“(iii) separately, with respect to each plan year, the net gain (if any) resulting from changes in actuarial assumptions used under the plan, over a period of 10 plan years,

“(C) the amount of the waived funding deficiency (within the meaning of section 302(c)(3)) for the plan year, and

“(D) in the case of a plan year for which the accumulated funding deficiency is deter-

mined under the funding standard account if such plan year follows a plan year for which such deficiency was determined under the alternative minimum funding standard, the excess (if any) of any debit balance in the funding standard account (determined without regard to this subparagraph) over any debit balance in the alternative minimum funding standard account.

“(4) COMBINING AND OFFSETTING AMOUNTS TO BE AMORTIZED.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, amounts required to be amortized under paragraph (2) or paragraph (3), as the case may be—

“(A) may be combined into one amount under such paragraph to be amortized over a period determined on the basis of the remaining amortization period for all items entering into such combined amount, and

“(B) may be offset against amounts required to be amortized under the other such paragraph, with the resulting amount to be amortized over a period determined on the basis of the remaining amortization periods for all items entering into whichever of the two amounts being offset is the greater.

“(5) INTEREST.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the funding standard account (and items therein) shall be charged or credited (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury) with interest at the appropriate rate consistent with the rate or rates of interest used under the plan to determine costs.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—The interest rate used for purposes of computing the amortization charge described in subsection (b)(2)(C) or for purposes of any arrangement under subsection (d) for any plan year shall be the greater of—

“(i) 150 percent of the Federal mid-term rate (as in effect under section 1274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for the 1st month of such plan year), or

“(ii) the rate of interest determined under subparagraph (A).

“(6) AMORTIZATION SCHEDULES IN EFFECT.—Amortization schedules for amounts described in paragraphs (2) and (3) that are in effect as of the last day of the last plan year beginning before January 1, 2014, by reason of section 104 of the Pension Protection Act of 2006 shall remain in effect pursuant to their terms and this section, except that such amounts shall not be amortized again under this section.

“(c) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) DETERMINATIONS TO BE MADE UNDER FUNDING METHOD.—For purposes of this section, normal costs, accrued liability, past service liabilities, and experience gains and losses shall be determined under the funding method used to determine costs under the plan.

“(2) VALUATION OF ASSETS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the value of the plan's assets shall be determined on the basis of any reasonable actuarial method of valuation which takes into account fair market value and which is permitted under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(B) DEDICATED BOND PORTFOLIO.—The Secretary of the Treasury may by regulations provide that the value of any dedicated bond portfolio of a plan shall be determined by using the interest rate under section 302(b)(5) (as in effect on the day before the enactment of the Pension Protection Act of 2006).

“(3) ACTUARIAL ASSUMPTIONS MUST BE REASONABLE.—For purposes of this section, all costs, liabilities, rates of interest, and other factors under the plan shall be determined on the basis of actuarial assumptions and methods—

“(A) each of which is reasonable (taking into account the experience of the plan and reasonable expectations), and

“(B) which, in combination, offer the actuary's best estimate of anticipated experience under the plan.

“(4) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN CHANGES AS EXPERIENCE GAIN OR LOSS.—For purposes of this section, if—

“(A) a change in benefits under the Social Security Act or in other retirement benefits created under Federal or State law, or

“(B) a change in the definition of the term ‘wages’ under section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or a change in the amount of such wages taken into account under regulations prescribed for purposes of section 401(a)(5) of such Code, results in an increase or decrease in accrued liability under a plan, such increase or decrease shall be treated as an experience loss or gain.

“(5) FUNDING METHOD AND PLAN YEAR.—

“(A) FUNDING METHODS AVAILABLE.—All funding methods available to CSEC plans under section 302 (as in effect on the day before the enactment of the Pension Protection Act of 2006) shall continue to be available under this section.

“(B) CHANGES.—If the funding method for a plan is changed, the new funding method shall become the funding method used to determine costs and liabilities under the plan only if the change is approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. If the plan year for a plan is changed, the new plan year shall become the plan year for the plan only if the change is approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(C) APPROVAL REQUIRED FOR CERTAIN CHANGES IN ASSUMPTIONS BY CERTAIN SINGLE-EMPLOYER PLANS SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL FUNDING REQUIREMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—No actuarial assumption (other than the assumptions described in subsection (h)(3)) used to determine the current liability for a plan to which this subparagraph applies may be changed without the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(ii) PLANS TO WHICH SUBPARAGRAPH APPLIES.—This subparagraph shall apply to a plan only if—

“(I) the plan is a CSEC plan,

“(II) the aggregate unfunded vested benefits as of the close of the preceding plan year (as determined under section 4006(a)(3)(E)(iii)) of such plan and all other plans maintained by the contributing sponsors (as defined in section 4001(a)(13)) and members of such sponsors' controlled groups (as defined in section 4001(a)(14)) which are covered by title IV (disregarding plans with no unfunded vested benefits) exceed \$50,000,000, and

“(III) the change in assumptions (determined after taking into account any changes in interest rate and mortality table) results in a decrease in the funding shortfall of the plan for the current plan year that exceeds \$50,000,000, or that exceeds \$5,000,000 and that is 5 percent or more of the current liability of the plan before such change.

“(6) FULL FUNDING.—If, as of the close of a plan year, a plan would (without regard to this paragraph) have an accumulated funding deficiency (determined without regard to the alternative minimum funding standard account permitted under subsection (e)) in excess of the full funding limitation—

“(A) the funding standard account shall be credited with the amount of such excess, and

“(B) all amounts described in paragraphs (2)(B), (C), and (D) and (3)(B) of subsection (b) which are required to be amortized shall be considered fully amortized for purposes of such paragraphs.

“(7) FULL-FUNDING LIMITATION.—For purposes of paragraph (6), the term ‘full-funding limitation’ means the excess (if any) of—

“(A) the accrued liability (including normal cost) under the plan (determined under the entry age normal funding method if such accrued liability cannot be directly calculated under the funding method used for the plan), over

“(B) the lesser of—

“(i) the fair market value of the plan’s assets, or

“(ii) the value of such assets determined under paragraph (2).

“(C) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In no event shall the full-funding limitation determined under subparagraph (A) be less than the excess (if any) of—

“(I) 90 percent of the current liability (determined without regard to paragraph (4) of subsection (h)) of the plan (including the expected increase in such current liability due to benefits accruing during the plan year), over

“(II) the value of the plan’s assets determined under paragraph (2).

“(ii) ASSETS.—For purposes of clause (i), assets shall not be reduced by any credit balance in the funding standard account.

“(8) ANNUAL VALUATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a determination of experience gains and losses and a valuation of the plan’s liability shall be made not less frequently than once every year, except that such determination shall be made more frequently to the extent required in particular cases under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(B) VALUATION DATE.—

“(i) CURRENT YEAR.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the valuation referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be made as of a date within the plan year to which the valuation refers or within one month prior to the beginning of such year.

“(ii) USE OF PRIOR YEAR VALUATION.—The valuation referred to in subparagraph (A) may be made as of a date within the plan year prior to the year to which the valuation refers if, as of such date, the value of the assets of the plan are not less than 100 percent of the plan’s current liability.

“(iii) ADJUSTMENTS.—Information under clause (ii) shall, in accordance with regulations, be actuarially adjusted to reflect significant differences in participants.

“(iv) LIMITATION.—A change in funding method to use a prior year valuation, as provided in clause (ii), may not be made unless as of the valuation date within the prior plan year, the value of the assets of the plan are not less than 125 percent of the plan’s current liability.

“(9) TIME WHEN CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS DEEMED MADE.—For purposes of this section, any contributions for a plan year made by an employer during the period—

“(A) beginning on the day after the last day of such plan year, and

“(B) ending on the day which is 8½ months after the close of the plan year, shall be deemed to have been made on such last day.

“(10) ANTICIPATION OF BENEFIT INCREASES EFFECTIVE IN THE FUTURE.—In determining projected benefits, the funding method of a collectively bargained CSEC plan described

in section 413(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall anticipate benefit increases scheduled to take effect during the term of the collective bargaining agreement applicable to the plan.

“(d) EXTENSION OF AMORTIZATION PERIODS.—The period of years required to amortize any unfunded liability (described in any clause of subsection (b)(2)(B)) of any plan may be extended by the Secretary of the Treasury for a period of time (not in excess of 10 years) if such Secretary determines that such extension would carry out the purposes of this Act and provide adequate protection for participants under the plan and their beneficiaries, and if such Secretary determines that the failure to permit such extension would result in—

“(1) a substantial risk to the voluntary continuation of the plan, or

“(2) a substantial curtailment of pension benefit levels or employee compensation.

“(e) ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM FUNDING STANDARD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A CSEC plan which uses a funding method that requires contributions in all years not less than those required under the entry age normal funding method may maintain an alternative minimum funding standard account for any plan year. Such account shall be credited and charged solely as provided in this subsection.

“(2) CHARGES AND CREDITS TO ACCOUNT.—For a plan year the alternative minimum funding standard account shall be—

“(A) charged with the sum of—

“(i) the lesser of normal cost under the funding method used under the plan or normal cost determined under the unit credit method,

“(ii) the excess, if any, of the present value of accrued benefits under the plan over the fair market value of the assets, and

“(iii) an amount equal to the excess (if any) of credits to the alternative minimum standard account for all prior plan years over charges to such account for all such years, and

“(B) credited with the amount considered contributed by the employer to or under the plan for the plan year.

“(3) INTEREST.—The alternative minimum funding standard account (and items therein) shall be charged or credited with interest in the manner provided under subsection (b)(5) with respect to the funding standard account.

“(f) QUARTERLY CONTRIBUTIONS REQUIRED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a CSEC plan which has a funded current liability percentage for the preceding plan year of less than 100 percent fails to pay the full amount of a required installment for the plan year, then the rate of interest charged to the funding standard account under subsection (b)(5) with respect to the amount of the underpayment for the period of the underpayment shall be equal to the greater of—

“(A) 175 percent of the Federal mid-term rate (as in effect under section 1274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for the 1st month of such plan year), or

“(B) the rate of interest used under the plan in determining costs.

“(2) AMOUNT OF UNDERPAYMENT, PERIOD OF UNDERPAYMENT.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

“(A) AMOUNT.—The amount of the underpayment shall be the excess of—

“(i) the required installment, over

“(ii) the amount (if any) of the installment contributed to or under the plan on or before the due date for the installment.

“(B) PERIOD OF UNDERPAYMENT.—The period for which interest is charged under this subsection with regard to any portion of the underpayment shall run from the due date for the installment to the date on which such portion is contributed to or under the plan (determined without regard to subsection (c)(9)).

“(C) ORDER OF CREDITING CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), contributions shall be credited against unpaid required installments in the order in which such installments are required to be paid.

“(3) NUMBER OF REQUIRED INSTALLMENTS; DUE DATES.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) PAYABLE IN 4 INSTALLMENTS.—There shall be 4 required installments for each plan year.

“(B) TIME FOR PAYMENT OF INSTALLMENTS.—

**“In the case of the following required installments:      The due date is:**

1st .....	April 15
2nd .....	July 15
3rd .....	October 15
4th .....	January 15 of the following year.

“(4) AMOUNT OF REQUIRED INSTALLMENT.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of any required installment shall be 25 percent of the required annual payment.

“(B) REQUIRED ANNUAL PAYMENT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘required annual payment’ means the lesser of—

“(i) 90 percent of the amount required to be contributed to or under the plan by the employer for the plan year under section 302 (without regard to any waiver under subsection (c) thereof), or

“(ii) 100 percent of the amount so required for the preceding plan year.

Clause (ii) shall not apply if the preceding plan year was not a year of 12 months.

“(5) LIQUIDITY REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A plan to which this paragraph applies shall be treated as failing to pay the full amount of any required installment to the extent that the value of the liquid assets paid in such installment is less than the liquidity shortfall (whether or not such liquidity shortfall exceeds the amount of such installment required to be paid but for this paragraph).

“(B) PLANS TO WHICH PARAGRAPH APPLIES.—This paragraph shall apply to a CSEC plan other than a plan described in section 302(d)(6)(A) (as in effect on the day before the enactment of the Pension Protection Act of 2006) which—

“(i) is required to pay installments under this subsection for a plan year, and

“(ii) has a liquidity shortfall for any quarter during such plan year.

“(C) PERIOD OF UNDERPAYMENT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), any portion of an installment that is treated as not paid under

subparagraph (A) shall continue to be treated as unpaid until the close of the quarter in which the due date for such installment occurs.

“(D) LIMITATION ON INCREASE.—If the amount of any required installment is increased by reason of subparagraph (A), in no event shall such increase exceed the amount which, when added to prior installments for the plan year, is necessary to increase the funded current liability percentage (taking into account the expected increase in current liability due to benefits accruing during the plan year) to 100 percent.

“(E) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph—

“(i) LIQUIDITY SHORTFALL.—The term ‘liquidity shortfall’ means, with respect to any required installment, an amount equal to the excess (as of the last day of the quarter for which such installment is made) of the base amount with respect to such quarter over the value (as of such last day) of the plan’s liquid assets.

“(ii) BASE AMOUNT.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘base amount’ means, with respect to any quarter, an amount equal to 3 times the sum of the adjusted disbursements from the plan for the 12 months ending on the last day of such quarter.

“(II) SPECIAL RULE.—If the amount determined under subclause (I) exceeds an amount equal to 2 times the sum of the adjusted disbursements from the plan for the 36 months ending on the last day of the quarter and an enrolled actuary certifies to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that such excess is the result of nonrecurring circumstances, the base amount with respect to such quarter shall be determined without regard to amounts related to those nonrecurring circumstances.

“(iii) DISBURSEMENTS FROM THE PLAN.—The term ‘disbursements from the plan’ means all disbursements from the trust, including purchases of annuities, payments of single sums and other benefits, and administrative expenses.

“(iv) ADJUSTED DISBURSEMENTS.—The term ‘adjusted disbursements’ means disbursements from the plan reduced by the product of—

“(I) the plan’s funded current liability percentage for the plan year, and

“(II) the sum of the purchases of annuities, payments of single sums, and such other disbursements as the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide in regulations.

“(v) LIQUID ASSETS.—The term ‘liquid assets’ means cash, marketable securities and such other assets as specified by the Secretary of the Treasury in regulations.

“(vi) QUARTER.—The term ‘quarter’ means, with respect to any required installment, the 3-month period preceding the month in which the due date for such installment occurs.

“(F) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out this paragraph.

“(6) FISCAL YEARS AND SHORT YEARS.—

“(A) FISCAL YEARS.—In applying this subsection to a plan year beginning on any date other than January 1, there shall be substituted for the months specified in this subsection, the months which correspond thereto.

“(B) SHORT PLAN YEAR.—This subsection shall be applied to plan years of less than 12 months in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(g) IMPOSITION OF LIEN WHERE FAILURE TO MAKE REQUIRED CONTRIBUTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a plan to which this section applies, if—

“(A) any person fails to make a required installment under subsection (f) or any other payment required under this section before the due date for such installment or other payment, and

“(B) the unpaid balance of such installment or other payment (including interest), when added to the aggregate unpaid balance of all preceding such installments or other payments for which payment was not made before the due date (including interest), exceeds \$1,000,000,

then there shall be a lien in favor of the plan in the amount determined under paragraph (3) upon all property and rights to property, whether real or personal, belonging to such person and any other person who is a member of the same controlled group of which such person is a member.

“(2) PLANS TO WHICH SUBSECTION APPLIES.—This subsection shall apply to a CSEC plan for any plan year for which the funded current liability percentage of such plan is less than 100 percent. This subsection shall not apply to any plan to which section 4021 does not apply (as such section is in effect on the date of the enactment of the Retirement Protection Act of 1994).

“(3) AMOUNT OF LIEN.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the amount of the lien shall be equal to the aggregate unpaid balance of required installments and other payments required under this section (including interest)—

“(A) for plan years beginning after 1987, and

“(B) for which payment has not been made before the due date.

“(4) NOTICE OF FAILURE; LIEN.—

“(A) NOTICE OF FAILURE.—A person committing a failure described in paragraph (1) shall notify the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation of such failure within 10 days of the due date for the required installment or other payment.

“(B) PERIOD OF LIEN.—The lien imposed by paragraph (1) shall arise on the due date for the required installment or other payment and shall continue until the last day of the first plan year in which the plan ceases to be described in paragraph (1)(B). Such lien shall continue to run without regard to whether such plan continues to be described in paragraph (2) during the period referred to in the preceding sentence.

“(C) CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.—Any amount with respect to which a lien is imposed under paragraph (1) shall be treated as taxes due and owing the United States and rules similar to the rules of subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 4068 shall apply with respect to a lien imposed by subsection (a) and the amount with respect to such lien.

“(5) ENFORCEMENT.—Any lien created under paragraph (1) may be perfected and enforced only by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, or at the direction of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, by any contributing employer (or any member of the controlled group of the contributing employer).

“(6) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) DUE DATE; REQUIRED INSTALLMENT.—The terms ‘due date’ and ‘required installment’ have the meanings given such terms by subsection (f), except that in the case of a payment other than a required installment, the due date shall be the date such payment is required to be made under this section.

“(B) CONTROLLED GROUP.—The term ‘controlled group’ means any group treated as a single employer under subsections (b), (c), (m), and (o) of section 414 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(h) CURRENT LIABILITY.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘current liability’ means all liabilities to employees and their beneficiaries under the plan.

“(2) TREATMENT OF UNPREDICTABLE CONTINGENT EVENT BENEFITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), any unpredictable contingent event benefit shall not be taken into account until the event on which the benefit is contingent occurs.

“(B) UNPREDICTABLE CONTINGENT EVENT BENEFIT.—The term ‘unpredictable contingent event benefit’ means any benefit contingent on an event other than—

“(i) age, service, compensation, death, or disability, or

“(ii) an event which is reasonably and reliably predictable (as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury).

“(3) INTEREST RATE AND MORTALITY ASSUMPTIONS USED.—

“(A) INTEREST RATE.—The rate of interest used to determine current liability under this section shall be the third segment rate determined under section 303(h)(2)(C).

“(B) MORTALITY TABLES.—

“(i) SECRETARIAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Treasury may by regulation prescribe mortality tables to be used in determining current liability under this subsection. Such tables shall be based upon the actual experience of pension plans and projected trends in such experience. In prescribing such tables, the Secretary of the Treasury shall take into account results of available independent studies of mortality of individuals covered by pension plans.

“(ii) PERIODIC REVIEW.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall periodically (at least every 5 years) review any tables in effect under this subsection and shall, to the extent the Secretary of the Treasury determines necessary, by regulation update the tables to reflect the actual experience of pension plans and projected trends in such experience.

“(C) SEPARATE MORTALITY TABLES FOR THE DISABLED.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (B)—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of plan years beginning after December 31, 1995, the Secretary of the Treasury shall establish mortality tables which may be used (in lieu of the tables under subparagraph (B)) to determine current liability under this subsection for individuals who are entitled to benefits under the plan on account of disability. The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish separate tables for individuals whose disabilities occur in plan years beginning before January 1, 1995, and for individuals whose disabilities occur in plan years beginning on or after such date.

“(ii) SPECIAL RULE FOR DISABILITIES OCCURRING AFTER 1994.—In the case of disabilities occurring in plan years beginning after December 31, 1994, the tables under clause (i) shall apply only with respect to individuals described in such subclause who are disabled within the meaning of title II of the Social Security Act and the regulations thereunder.

“(4) CERTAIN SERVICE DISREGARDED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a participant to whom this paragraph applies, only the applicable percentage of the years of service before such individual became a participant shall be taken into account in computing the current liability of the plan.

“(B) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the applicable percentage shall be determined as follows:



**"If the years of participation are:**

1 .....	20
2 .....	40
3 .....	60
4 .....	80
5 or more .....	100.

**The applicable percentage is:**

"(C) PARTICIPANTS TO WHOM PARAGRAPH APPLIES.—This subparagraph shall apply to any participant who, at the time of becoming a participant—

"(i) has not accrued any other benefit under any defined benefit plan (whether or not terminated) maintained by the employer or a member of the same controlled group of which the employer is a member,

"(ii) who first becomes a participant under the plan in a plan year beginning after December 31, 1987, and

"(iii) has years of service greater than the minimum years of service necessary for eligibility to participate in the plan.

"(D) ELECTION.—An employer may elect not to have this subparagraph apply. Such an election, once made, may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(i) FUNDED CURRENT LIABILITY PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'funded current liability percentage' means, with respect to any plan year, the percentage which—

"(1) the value of the plan's assets determined under subsection (c)(2), is of

"(2) the current liability under the plan.

"(j) FUNDING RESTORATION STATUS.—Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section—

"(1) NORMAL COST PAYMENT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a CSEC plan that is in funding restoration status for a plan year, for purposes of section 302, the term 'accumulated funding deficiency' means, for such plan year, the greater of—

"(i) the amount described in subsection (a), or

"(ii) the excess of the normal cost of the plan for the plan year over the amount actually contributed to or under the plan for the plan year.

"(B) NORMAL COST.—In the case of a CSEC plan that uses a spread gain funding method, for purposes of this subsection, the term 'normal cost' means normal cost as determined under the entry age normal funding method.

"(2) PLAN AMENDMENTS.—In the case of a CSEC plan that is in funding restoration status for a plan year, no amendment to such plan may take effect during such plan year if such amendment has the effect of increasing liabilities of the plan by means of increases in benefits, establishment of new benefits, changing the rate of benefit accrual, or changing the rate at which benefits become nonforfeitable. This paragraph shall not apply to any plan amendment that is required to comply with any applicable law. This paragraph shall cease to apply with respect to any plan year, effective as of the first day of the plan year (or if later, the effective date of the amendment) upon payment by the plan sponsor of a contribution to the plan (in addition to any contribution required under this section without regard to this paragraph) in an amount equal to the

increase in the funding liability of the plan attributable to the plan amendment.

"(3) FUNDING RESTORATION PLAN.—The sponsor of a CSEC plan shall establish a written funding restoration plan within 180 days of the receipt by the plan sponsor of a certification from the plan actuary that the plan is in funding restoration status for a plan year. Such funding restoration plan shall consist of actions that are calculated, based on reasonably anticipated experience and reasonable actuarial assumptions, to increase the plan's funded percentage to 100 percent over a period that is not longer than the greater of 7 years or the shortest amount of time practicable. Such funding restoration plan shall take into account contributions required under this section (without regard to this paragraph). If a plan remains in funding restoration status for 2 or more years, such funding restoration plan shall be updated each year after the 1st such year within 180 days of receipt by the plan sponsor of a certification from the plan actuary that the plan remains in funding restoration status for the plan year.

"(4) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION BY PLAN ACTUARY.—Not later than the 90th day of each plan year of a CSEC plan, the plan actuary shall certify to the plan sponsor whether or not the plan is in funding restoration status for the plan year, based on the plan's funded percentage as of the beginning of the plan year. For this purpose, the actuary may conclusively rely on an estimate of—

"(A) the plan's funding liability, based on the funding liability of the plan for the preceding plan year and on reasonable actuarial estimates, assumptions, and methods, and

"(B) the amount of any contributions reasonably anticipated to be made for the preceding plan year.

Contributions described in subparagraph (B) shall be taken into account in determining the plan's funded percentage as of the beginning of the plan year.

"(5) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) FUNDING RESTORATION STATUS.—A CSEC plan shall be treated as in funding restoration status for a plan year if the plan's funded percentage as of the beginning of such plan year is less than 80 percent.

"(B) FUNDED PERCENTAGE.—The term 'funded percentage' means the ratio (expressed as a percentage) which—

"(i) the value of plan assets (as determined under subsection (c)(2)), bears to

"(ii) the plan's funding liability.

"(C) FUNDING LIABILITY.—The term 'funding liability' for a plan year means the present value of all benefits accrued or earned under the plan as of the beginning of the plan year, based on the assumptions used by the plan pursuant to this section, including the interest rate described in subsection (b)(5)(A) (without regard to subsection (b)(5)(B)).

"(D) SPREAD GAIN FUNDING METHOD.—The term 'spread gain funding method' has the meaning given such term under rules and forms issued by the Secretary of the Treasury."

(b) SEPARATE RULES FOR CSEC PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 302(a) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1082(a)) is amended by striking "and" at the end of sub-

paragraph (B), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting "and", and by inserting at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(D) in the case of a CSEC plan, the employers make contributions to or under the plan for any plan year which, in the aggregate, are sufficient to ensure that the plan does not have an accumulated funding deficiency under section 306 as of the end of the plan year."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 302 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1082) is amended—

(A) by striking "multiemployer plan" the first place it appears in clause (i) of subsection (c)(1)(A) and the last place it appears in paragraph (2) of subsection (d), and inserting "multiemployer plan or a CSEC plan",

(B) by striking "303(j)" in paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting "303(j) or under section 306(f)",

(C)(i) by striking "and" at the end of clause (i) of subsection (c)(1)(B),

(ii) by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) of subsection (c)(1)(B), and inserting "and", and

(iii) by inserting the following new clause after clause (ii) of subsection (c)(1)(B):

"(iii) in the case of a CSEC plan, the funding standard account shall be credited under section 306(b)(3)(C) with the amount of the waived funding deficiency and such amount shall be amortized as required under section 306(b)(2)(C)."

(D) by striking "under paragraph (1)" in clause (i) of subsection (c)(4)(A) and inserting "under paragraph (1) or for granting an extension under section 306(d)",

(E) by striking "waiver under this subsection" in subparagraph (B) of subsection (c)(4) and inserting "waiver under this subsection or an extension under 306(d)",

(F) by striking "waiver or modification" in subclause (I) of subsection (c)(4)(B)(i) and inserting "waiver, modification, or extension",

(G) by striking "waivers" in the heading of subsection (c)(4)(C) and of clause (ii) of subsection (c)(4)(C) and inserting "waivers or extensions",

(H) by striking "section 304(d)" in subparagraph (A) of subsection (c)(7) and in paragraph (2) of subsection (d) and inserting "section 304(d) or section 306(d)",

(I) by striking "and" at the end of subclause (I) of subsection (c)(4)(C)(i) and adding "or the accumulated funding deficiency under section 306, whichever is applicable,"

(J) by striking "303(e)(2)." in subclause (II) of subsection (c)(4)(C)(i) and inserting "303(e)(2) or 306(b)(2)(C), whichever is applicable, and",

(K) by adding immediately after subclause (II) of subsection (c)(4)(C)(i) the following new subclause:

"(III) the total amounts not paid by reason of an extension in effect under section 306(d)."

(L) by striking "for waivers of" in clause (ii) of subsection (c)(4)(C) and inserting "for waivers or extensions with respect to", and

(M) by striking "single-employer plan" in subparagraph (A) of subsection (a)(2) and in clause (i) of subsection (c)(1)(B) and inserting "single-employer plan (other than a CSEC plan)".

(3) **BENEFIT RESTRICTIONS.**—Subsection (g) of section 206 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1056) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(12) **CSEC PLANS.**—This subsection shall not apply to a CSEC plan (as defined in section 210(f)).”

(4) **BENEFIT INCREASES.**—Paragraph (3) of section 204(i) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1054(i)) is amended by striking “multiemployer plans” and inserting “multiemployer plans or CSEC plans”.

(5) **SECTION 103.**—Subparagraph (B) of section 103(d)(8) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1023(d)(8)) is amended by striking “303(h) and 304(c)(3)” and inserting “303(h), 304(c)(3), and 306(c)(3)”.

(6) **SECTION 502.**—Subsection (c) of section 502 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 is amended—

(A) by redesignating the last paragraph as paragraph (11), and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(12) The Secretary may assess a civil penalty against any sponsor of a CSEC plan of up to \$100 a day from the date of the plan sponsor's failure to comply with the requirements of section 306(j)(3) to establish or update a funding restoration plan.”

(7) **SECTION 4003.**—Subparagraph (B) of section 4003(e)(1) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1303(e)(1)) is amended by striking “303(k)(1)(A) and (B) of this Act or section 430(k)(1)(A) and (B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986” and inserting “303(k)(1)(A) and (B) or 306(g)(1)(A) and (B) of this Act or section 430(k)(1)(A) and (B) or 433(g)(1)(A) and (B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986”.

(8) **SECTION 4010.**—Paragraph (2) of section 4010(b) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1310(b)) is amended by striking “303(k)(1)(A) and (B) of this Act or section 430(k)(1)(A) and (B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986” and inserting “303(k)(1)(A) and (B) or 306(g)(1)(A) and (B) of this Act or section 430(k)(1)(A) and (B) or 433(g)(1)(A) and (B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986”.

(9) **SECTION 4071.**—Section 4071 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1371) is amended by striking “section 303(k)(4)” and inserting “section 303(k)(4) or 306(g)(4)”.

#### SEC. 103. ELECTIONS.

(a) **ELECTION NOT TO BE TREATED AS A CSEC PLAN.**—Subsection (f) of section 210 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as added by section 101, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **ELECTION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If a plan falls within the definition of a CSEC plan under this subsection (without regard to this paragraph), such plan shall be a CSEC plan unless the plan sponsor elects not later than the close of the first plan year of the plan beginning after December 31, 2013, not to be treated as a CSEC plan. An election under the preceding sentence shall take effect for such plan year and, once made, may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(B) **SPECIAL RULE.**—If a plan described in subparagraph (A) is treated as a CSEC plan, section 104 of the Pension Protection Act of 2006, as amended by the Preservation of Access to Care for Medicare Beneficiaries and Pension Relief Act of 2010, shall cease to apply to such plan as of the first date as of which such plan is treated as a CSEC plan.”

(b) **ELECTION TO CEASE TO BE TREATED AS AN ELIGIBLE CHARITY PLAN.**—Subsection (d)

of section 104 of the Pension Protection Act of 2006, as added by section 202 of the Preservation of Access to Care for Medicare Beneficiaries and Pension Relief Act of 2010, is amended—

(1) by striking “For purposes of” and inserting “(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **ELECTION NOT TO BE AN ELIGIBLE CHARITY PLAN.**—A plan sponsor may elect for a plan to cease to be treated as an eligible charity plan for plan years beginning after December 31, 2013. Such election shall be made at such time and in such form and manner as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Any such election may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(3) **ELECTION TO USE FUNDING OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO OTHER PLAN SPONSORS.**—

“(A) A plan sponsor that makes the election described in paragraph (2) may elect for a plan to apply the rules described in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) for plan years beginning after December 31, 2013. Such election shall be made at such time and in such form and manner as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Any such election may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(B) Under the rules described in this subparagraph, for the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2013, a plan has—

“(i) an 11-year shortfall amortization base,

“(ii) a 12-year shortfall amortization base, and

“(iii) a 7-year shortfall amortization base.

“(C) Under the rules described in this subparagraph, section 303(c)(2)(A) and (B) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and section 430(c)(2)(A) and (B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied by—

“(i) in the case of an 11-year shortfall amortization base, substituting ‘11-plan-year period’ for ‘7-plan-year period’ wherever such phrase appears, and

“(ii) in the case of a 12-year shortfall amortization base, substituting ‘12-plan-year period’ for ‘7-plan-year period’ wherever such phrase appears.

“(D) Under the rules described in this subparagraph, section 303(c)(7) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and section 430(c)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall apply to a plan for which an election has been made under subparagraph (A). Such provisions shall apply in the following manner:

“(i) The first plan year beginning after December 31, 2013, shall be treated as an election year, and no other plan years shall be so treated.

“(ii) All references in section 303(c)(7) of such Act and section 430(c)(7) of such Code to ‘February 28, 2010’ or ‘March 1, 2010’ shall be treated as references to ‘February 28, 2013’ or ‘March 1, 2013’, respectively.

“(E) For purposes of this paragraph, the 11-year amortization base is an amount, determined for the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2013, equal to the unamortized principal amount of the shortfall amortization base (as defined in section 303(c)(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and section 430(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) that would have applied to the plan for the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2009, if—

“(i) the plan had never been an eligible charity plan,

“(ii) the plan sponsor had made the election described in section 303(c)(2)(D)(i) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and in section 430(c)(2)(D)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to have section 303(c)(2)(D)(i) of such Act and section

430(c)(2)(D)(iii) of such Code apply with respect to the shortfall amortization base for the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2009, and

“(iii) no event had occurred under paragraph (6) or (7) of section 303(c) of such Act or paragraph (6) or (7) of section 430(c) of such Code that, as of the first day of the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2013, would have modified the shortfall amortization base or the shortfall amortization installments with respect to the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2009.

“(F) For purposes of this paragraph, the 12-year amortization base is an amount, determined for the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2013, equal to the unamortized principal amount of the shortfall amortization base (as defined in section 303(c)(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and section 430(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) that would have applied to the plan for the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2010, if—

“(i) the plan had never been an eligible charity plan,

“(ii) the plan sponsor had made the election described in section 303(c)(2)(D)(i) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and in section 430(c)(2)(D)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to have section 303(c)(2)(D)(i) of such Act and section 430(c)(2)(D)(iii) of such Code apply with respect to the shortfall amortization base for the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2010, and

“(iii) no event had occurred under paragraph (6) or (7) of section 303(c) of such Act or paragraph (6) or (7) of section 430(c) of such Code that, as of the first day of the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2013, would have modified the shortfall amortization base or the shortfall amortization installments with respect to the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2010.

“(G) For purposes of this paragraph, the 7-year shortfall amortization base is an amount, determined for the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2013, equal to—

“(i) the shortfall amortization base for the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2013, without regard to this paragraph, minus

“(ii) the sum of the 11-year shortfall amortization base and the 12-year shortfall amortization base.

“(4) **RETROACTIVE ELECTION.**—Not later than December 31, 2014, a plan sponsor may make a one-time, irrevocable, retroactive election to not be treated as an eligible charity plan. Such election shall be effective for plan years beginning after December 31, 2007, and shall be made by providing reasonable notice to the Secretary of the Treasury.”

(c) **DEEMED ELECTION.**—For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, sections 4(b)(2) and 4021(b)(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and all other purposes, a plan shall be deemed to have made an irrevocable election under section 410(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 if—

(1) the plan was established before January 1, 2014;

(2) the plan falls within the definition of a CSEC plan;

(3) the plan sponsor does not make an election under section 210(f)(3)(A) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and section 414(y)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this Act; and

(4) the plan, plan sponsor, administrator, or fiduciary remits one or more premium payments for the plan to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation for a plan year beginning after December 31, 2013.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply as of the date of enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 104. TRANSPARENCY.

(a) **NOTICE TO PARTICIPANTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (2) of section 101(f) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1021(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) **EFFECT OF CSEC PLAN RULES ON PLAN FUNDING.**—In the case of a CSEC plan, each notice under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(i) a statement that different rules apply to CSEC plans than apply to single-employer plans,

“(ii) for the first 2 plan years beginning after December 31, 2013, a statement that, as a result of changes in the law made by the Cooperative and Small Employer Charity Pension Flexibility Act, the contributions to the plan may have changed, and

“(iii) in the case of a CSEC plan that is in funding restoration status for the plan year, a statement that the plan is in funding restoration status for such plan year.

A copy of the statement required under clause (iii) shall be provided to the Secretary, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.”.

(2) **MODEL NOTICE.**—The Secretary of Labor may modify the model notice required to be published under section 501(c) of the Pension Protection Act of 2006 to include the information described in section 101(f)(2)(E) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as added by this subsection.

(b) **NOTICE OF FAILURE TO MEET MINIMUM FUNDING STANDARDS.**—

(1) **PENDING WAIVERS.**—Paragraph (2) of section 101(d) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1021(d)) is amended by striking “303” and inserting “303 or 306”.

(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—Paragraph (3) of section 101(d) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (21 U.S.C. 1021(d)) is amended by striking “303(j)” and inserting “303(j) or 306(f), whichever is applicable”.

(c) **ADDITIONAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 103 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1023) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO MULTIPLE EMPLOYER PLANS.**—With respect to any multiple employer plan, an annual report under this section for a plan year shall include a list of participating employers and a good faith estimate of the percentage of total contributions made by such participating employers during the plan year.”.

#### SEC. 105. SPONSOR EDUCATION AND ASSISTANCE.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “CSEC plan” has the meaning given that term in subsection (f)(1) of section 210 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1060(f)(1)) (as added by this Act).

(b) **EDUCATION.**—The Participant and Plan Sponsor Advocate established under section 4004 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1304) shall make itself available to assist CSEC plan sponsors and participants as part of the duties it performs under the general supervision of the Board of Directors under section 4004(b) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1304(b)).

### TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986

#### SEC. 201. DEFINITION OF COOPERATIVE AND SMALL EMPLOYER CHARITY PENSION PLANS.

Section 414 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(y) **COOPERATIVE AND SMALL EMPLOYER CHARITY PENSION PLANS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this title, except as provided in this subsection, a CSEC plan is a defined benefit plan (other than a multiemployer plan)—

“(A) to which section 104 of the Pension Protection Act of 2006 applies, without regard to—

“(i) section 104(a)(2) of such Act;

“(ii) the amendments to such section 104 by section 202(b) of the Preservation of Access to Care for Medicare Beneficiaries and Pension Relief Act of 2010; and

“(iii) paragraph (3)(B); or

“(B) that, as of June 25, 2010, was maintained by more than one employer and all of the employers were organizations described in section 501(c)(3).

“(2) **AGGREGATION.**—All employers that are treated as a single employer under subsection (b) or (c) shall be treated as a single employer for purposes of determining if a plan was maintained by more than one employer under paragraph (1)(B).”.

#### SEC. 202. FUNDING RULES APPLICABLE TO COOPERATIVE AND SMALL EMPLOYER CHARITY PENSION PLANS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subpart A of part III of subchapter D of chapter 1 of subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### “SEC. 433. MINIMUM FUNDING STANDARDS.

“(a) **GENERAL RULE.**—For purposes of section 412, the term ‘accumulated funding deficiency’ for a CSEC plan means the excess of the total charges to the funding standard account for all plan years (beginning with the first plan year to which section 412 applies) over the total credits to such account for such years or, if less, the excess of the total charges to the alternative minimum funding standard account for such plan years over the total credits to such account for such years.

“(b) **FUNDING STANDARD ACCOUNT.**—

“(1) **ACCOUNT REQUIRED.**—Each plan to which this section applies shall establish and maintain a funding standard account. Such account shall be credited and charged solely as provided in this section.

“(2) **CHARGES TO ACCOUNT.**—For a plan year, the funding standard account shall be charged with the sum of—

“(A) the normal cost of the plan for the plan year,

“(B) the amounts necessary to amortize in equal annual installments (until fully amortized)—

“(i) in the case of a plan in existence on January 1, 1974, the unfunded past service liability under the plan on the first day of the first plan year to which section 412 applies, over a period of 40 plan years,

“(ii) in the case of a plan which comes into existence after January 1, 1974, but before the first day of the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2013, the unfunded past service liability under the plan on the first day of the first plan year to which section 412 applies, over a period of 30 plan years,

“(iii) separately, with respect to each plan year, the net increase (if any) in unfunded past service liability under the plan arising from plan amendments adopted in such year, over a period of 15 plan years,

“(iv) separately, with respect to each plan year, the net experience loss (if any) under the plan, over a period of 5 plan years, and

“(v) separately, with respect to each plan year, the net loss (if any) resulting from changes in actuarial assumptions used under the plan, over a period of 10 plan years,

“(C) the amount necessary to amortize each waived funding deficiency (within the meaning of section 412(c)(3)) for each prior plan year in equal annual installments (until fully amortized) over a period of 5 plan years,

“(D) the amount necessary to amortize in equal annual installments (until fully amortized) over a period of 5 plan years any amount credited to the funding standard account under paragraph (3)(D), and

“(E) the amount necessary to amortize in equal annual installments (until fully amortized) over a period of 20 years the contributions which would be required to be made under the plan but for the provisions of section 412(c)(7)(A)(i)(I) (as in effect on the day before the enactment of the Pension Protection Act of 2006).

“(3) **CREDITS TO ACCOUNT.**—For a plan year, the funding standard account shall be credited with the sum of—

“(A) the amount considered contributed by the employer to or under the plan for the plan year,

“(B) the amount necessary to amortize in equal annual installments (until fully amortized)—

“(i) separately, with respect to each plan year, the net decrease (if any) in unfunded past service liability under the plan arising from plan amendments adopted in such year, over a period of 15 plan years,

“(ii) separately, with respect to each plan year, the net experience gain (if any) under the plan, over a period of 5 plan years, and

“(iii) separately, with respect to each plan year, the net gain (if any) resulting from changes in actuarial assumptions used under the plan, over a period of 10 plan years,

“(C) the amount of the waived funding deficiency (within the meaning of section 412(c)(3)) for the plan year, and

“(D) in the case of a plan year for which the accumulated funding deficiency is determined under the funding standard account if such plan year follows a plan year for which such deficiency was determined under the alternative minimum funding standard, the excess (if any) of any debit balance in the funding standard account (determined without regard to this subparagraph) over any debit balance in the alternative minimum funding standard account.

“(4) **COMBINING AND OFFSETTING AMOUNTS TO BE AMORTIZED.**—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, amounts required to be amortized under paragraph (2) or paragraph (3), as the case may be—

“(A) may be combined into one amount under such paragraph to be amortized over a period determined on the basis of the remaining amortization period for all items entering into such combined amount, and

“(B) may be offset against amounts required to be amortized under the other such paragraph, with the resulting amount to be amortized over a period determined on the basis of the remaining amortization periods for all items entering into whichever of the two amounts being offset is the greater.

“(5) **INTEREST.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the funding standard account (and items therein) shall be charged or credited (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary) with interest at the appropriate rate consistent with the rate or rates of interest used under the plan to determine costs.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—The interest rate used for purposes of computing the amortization charge described in subsection (b)(2)(C) or for

purposes of any arrangement under subsection (d) for any plan year shall be the greater of—

“(i) 150 percent of the Federal mid-term rate (as in effect under section 1274 for the last month of such plan year), or

“(ii) the rate of interest determined under subparagraph (A).

“(6) AMORTIZATION SCHEDULES IN EFFECT.—Amortization schedules for amounts described in paragraphs (2) and (3) that are in effect as of the last day of the last plan year beginning before January 1, 2014, by reason of section 104 of the Pension Protection Act of 2006 shall remain in effect pursuant to their terms and this section, except that such amounts shall not be amortized again under this section.

“(c) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) DETERMINATIONS TO BE MADE UNDER FUNDING METHOD.—For purposes of this section, normal costs, accrued liability, past service liabilities, and experience gains and losses shall be determined under the funding method used to determine costs under the plan.

“(2) VALUATION OF ASSETS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the value of the plan's assets shall be determined on the basis of any reasonable actuarial method of valuation which takes into account fair market value and which is permitted under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

“(B) DEDICATED BOND PORTFOLIO.—The Secretary may by regulations provide that the value of any dedicated bond portfolio of a plan shall be determined by using the interest rate under section 412(b)(5) (as in effect on the day before the enactment of the Pension Protection Act of 2006).

“(3) ACTUARIAL ASSUMPTIONS MUST BE REASONABLE.—For purposes of this section, all costs, liabilities, rates of interest, and other factors under the plan shall be determined on the basis of actuarial assumptions and methods—

“(A) each of which is reasonable (taking into account the experience of the plan and reasonable expectations), and

“(B) which, in combination, offer the actuary's best estimate of anticipated experience under the plan.

“(4) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN CHANGES AS EXPERIENCE GAIN OR LOSS.—For purposes of this section, if—

“(A) a change in benefits under the Social Security Act or in other retirement benefits created under Federal or State law, or

“(B) a change in the definition of the term ‘wages’ under section 3121 or a change in the amount of such wages taken into account under regulations prescribed for purposes of section 401(a)(5),

results in an increase or decrease in accrued liability under a plan, such increase or decrease shall be treated as an experience loss or gain.

“(5) FUNDING METHOD AND PLAN YEAR.—

“(A) FUNDING METHODS AVAILABLE.—All funding methods available to CSEC plans under section 412 (as in effect on the day before the enactment of the Pension Protection Act of 2006) shall continue to be available under this section.

“(B) CHANGES.—If the funding method for a plan is changed, the new funding method shall become the funding method used to determine costs and liabilities under the plan only if the change is approved by the Secretary. If the plan year for a plan is changed, the new plan year shall become the plan year for the plan only if the change is approved by the Secretary.

“(C) APPROVAL REQUIRED FOR CERTAIN CHANGES IN ASSUMPTIONS BY CERTAIN SINGLE-EMPLOYER PLANS SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL FUNDING REQUIREMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—No actuarial assumption (other than the assumptions described in subsection (h)(3)) used to determine the current liability for a plan to which this subparagraph applies may be changed without the approval of the Secretary.

“(ii) PLANS TO WHICH SUBPARAGRAPH APPLIES.—This subparagraph shall apply to a plan only if—

“(I) the plan is a CSEC plan,

“(II) the aggregate unfunded vested benefits as of the close of the preceding plan year (as determined under section 4006(a)(3)(E)(iii) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974) of such plan and all other plans maintained by the contributing sponsors (as defined in section 4001(a)(13) of such Act) and members of such sponsors' controlled groups (as defined in section 4001(a)(14) of such Act) which are covered by title IV (disregarding plans with no unfunded vested benefits) exceed \$50,000,000, and

“(III) the change in assumptions (determined after taking into account any changes in interest rate and mortality table) results in a decrease in the funding shortfall of the plan for the current plan year that exceeds \$50,000,000, or that exceeds \$5,000,000 and that is 5 percent or more of the current liability of the plan before such change.

“(6) FULL FUNDING.—If, as of the close of a plan year, a plan would (without regard to this paragraph) have an accumulated funding deficiency (determined without regard to the alternative minimum funding standard account permitted under subsection (e)) in excess of the full funding limitation—

“(A) the funding standard account shall be credited with the amount of such excess, and

“(B) all amounts described in paragraphs (2)(B), (C), and (D) and (3)(B) of subsection (b) which are required to be amortized shall be considered fully amortized for purposes of such paragraphs.

“(7) FULL-FUNDING LIMITATION.—For purposes of paragraph (6), the term ‘full-funding limitation’ means the excess (if any) of—

“(A) the accrued liability (including normal cost) under the plan (determined under the entry age normal funding method if such accrued liability cannot be directly calculated under the funding method used for the plan), over

“(B) the lesser of—

“(i) the fair market value of the plan's assets, or

“(ii) the value of such assets determined under paragraph (2).

“(C) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In no event shall the full-funding limitation determined under subparagraph (A) be less than the excess (if any) of—

“(I) 90 percent of the current liability (determined without regard to paragraph (4) of subsection (h)) of the plan (including the expected increase in such current liability due to benefits accruing during the plan year), over

“(II) the value of the plan's assets determined under paragraph (2).

“(ii) ASSETS.—For purposes of clause (i), assets shall not be reduced by any credit balance in the funding standard account.

“(8) ANNUAL VALUATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a determination of experience gains and losses and a valuation of the plan's liability shall be made not less frequently than once every year, except that such determination shall be made more frequently to the extent required in particular cases under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

“(B) VALUATION DATE.—

“(i) CURRENT YEAR.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the valuation referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be made as of a date within the plan year to which the valuation

refers or within one month prior to the beginning of such year.

“(ii) USE OF PRIOR YEAR VALUATION.—The valuation referred to in subparagraph (A) may be made as of a date within the plan year prior to the year to which the valuation refers if, as of such date, the value of the assets of the plan are not less than 100 percent of the plan's current liability.

“(iii) ADJUSTMENTS.—Information under clause (ii) shall, in accordance with regulations, be actuarially adjusted to reflect significant differences in participants.

“(iv) LIMITATION.—A change in funding method to use a prior year valuation, as provided in clause (ii), may not be made unless as of the valuation date within the prior plan year, the value of the assets of the plan are not less than 125 percent of the plan's current liability.

“(9) TIME WHEN CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS DEEMED MADE.—For purposes of this section, any contributions for a plan year made by an employer during the period—

“(A) beginning on the day after the last day of such plan year, and

“(B) ending on the day which is 8½ months after the close of the plan year, shall be deemed to have been made on such last day.

“(10) ANTICIPATION OF BENEFIT INCREASES EFFECTIVE IN THE FUTURE.—In determining projected benefits, the funding method of a collectively bargained CSEC plan described in section 413(a) shall anticipate benefit increases scheduled to take effect during the term of the collective bargaining agreement applicable to the plan.

“(d) EXTENSION OF AMORTIZATION PERIODS.—The period of years required to amortize any unfunded liability (described in any clause of subsection (b)(2)(B)) of any plan may be extended by the Secretary for a period of time (not in excess of 10 years) if the Secretary determines that such extension would carry out the purposes of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and provide adequate protection for participants under the plan and their beneficiaries, and if the Secretary determines that the failure to permit such extension would result in—

“(1) a substantial risk to the voluntary continuation of the plan, or

“(2) a substantial curtailment of pension benefit levels or employee compensation.

“(e) ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM FUNDING STANDARD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A CSEC plan which uses a funding method that requires contributions in all years not less than those required under the entry age normal funding method may maintain an alternative minimum funding standard account for any plan year. Such account shall be credited and charged solely as provided in this subsection.

“(2) CHARGES AND CREDITS TO ACCOUNT.—For a plan year the alternative minimum funding standard account shall be—

“(A) charged with the sum of—

“(i) the lesser of normal cost under the funding method used under the plan or normal cost determined under the unit credit method,

“(ii) the excess, if any, of the present value of accrued benefits under the plan over the fair market value of the assets, and

“(iii) an amount equal to the excess (if any) of credits to the alternative minimum standard account for all prior plan years over charges to such account for all such years, and

“(B) credited with the amount considered contributed by the employer to or under the plan for the plan year.

“(3) INTEREST.—The alternative minimum funding standard account (and items therein) shall be charged or credited with interest in

the manner provided under subsection (b)(5) with respect to the funding standard account.

**“(f) QUARTERLY CONTRIBUTIONS REQUIRED.—**

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a CSEC plan which has a funded current liability percentage for the preceding plan year of less than 100 percent fails to pay the full amount of a required installment for the plan year, then the rate of interest charged to the funding standard account under subsection (b)(5) with respect to the amount of the underpayment for the period of the underpayment shall be equal to the greater of—

“(A) 175 percent of the Federal mid-term rate (as in effect under section 1274 for the 1st month of such plan year), or

“(B) the rate of interest used under the plan in determining costs.

**“(2) AMOUNT OF UNDERPAYMENT, PERIOD OF UNDERPAYMENT.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—**

“(A) AMOUNT.—The amount of the underpayment shall be the excess of—

“(i) the required installment, over

“(ii) the amount (if any) of the installment contributed to or under the plan on or before the due date for the installment.

“(B) PERIOD OF UNDERPAYMENT.—The period for which interest is charged under this subsection with regard to any portion of the underpayment shall run from the due date for the installment to the date on which such portion is contributed to or under the plan (determined without regard to subsection (c)(9)).

“(C) ORDER OF CREDITING CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), contributions shall be credited against unpaid required installments in the order in which such installments are required to be paid.

**“(3) NUMBER OF REQUIRED INSTALLMENTS; DUE DATES.—For purposes of this subsection—**

“(A) PAYABLE IN 4 INSTALLMENTS.—There shall be 4 required installments for each plan year.

“(B) TIME FOR PAYMENT OF INSTALLMENTS.—

**“In the case of the following required installments:**

**The due date is:**

1st .....	April 15
2nd .....	July 15
3rd .....	October 15
4th .....	January 15 of the following year.

**“(4) AMOUNT OF REQUIRED INSTALLMENT.—For purposes of this subsection—**

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of any required installment shall be 25 percent of the required annual payment.

“(B) REQUIRED ANNUAL PAYMENT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘required annual payment’ means the lesser of—

“(i) 90 percent of the amount required to be contributed to or under the plan by the employer for the plan year under section 412 (without regard to any waiver under subsection (c) thereof), or

“(ii) 100 percent of the amount so required for the preceding plan year.

Clause (ii) shall not apply if the preceding plan year was not a year of 12 months.

“(5) LIQUIDITY REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A plan to which this paragraph applies shall be treated as failing to pay the full amount of any required installment to the extent that the value of the liquid assets paid in such installment is less than the liquidity shortfall (whether or not such liquidity shortfall exceeds the amount of such installment required to be paid but for this paragraph).

“(B) PLANS TO WHICH PARAGRAPH APPLIES.—This paragraph shall apply to a CSEC plan other than a plan described in section 412(l)(6)(A) (as in effect on the day before the enactment of the Pension Protection Act of 2006) which—

“(i) is required to pay installments under this subsection for a plan year, and

“(ii) has a liquidity shortfall for any quarter during such plan year.

“(C) PERIOD OF UNDERPAYMENT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), any portion of an installment that is treated as not paid under subparagraph (A) shall continue to be treated as unpaid until the close of the quarter in which the due date for such installment occurs.

“(D) LIMITATION ON INCREASE.—If the amount of any required installment is increased by reason of subparagraph (A), in no event shall such increase exceed the amount which, when added to prior installments for the plan year, is necessary to increase the funded current liability percentage (taking into account the expected increase in current liability due to benefits accruing during the plan year) to 100 percent.

“(E) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph—

“(i) LIQUIDITY SHORTFALL.—The term ‘liquidity shortfall’ means, with respect to any required installment, an amount equal to the excess (as of the last day of the quarter for which such installment is made) of the base amount with respect to such quarter over the value (as of such last day) of the plan’s liquid assets.

“(ii) BASE AMOUNT.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘base amount’ means, with respect to any quarter, an amount equal to 3 times the sum of the adjusted disbursements from the plan for the 12 months ending on the last day of such quarter.

“(II) SPECIAL RULE.—If the amount determined under subclause (I) exceeds an amount equal to 2 times the sum of the adjusted disbursements from the plan for the 36 months ending on the last day of the quarter and an enrolled actuary certifies to the satisfaction of the Secretary that such excess is the result of nonrecurring circumstances, the base amount with respect to such quarter shall be determined without regard to amounts related to those nonrecurring circumstances.

“(iii) DISBURSEMENTS FROM THE PLAN.—The term ‘disbursements from the plan’ means all disbursements from the trust, including purchases of annuities, payments of single sums and other benefits, and administrative expenses.

“(iv) ADJUSTED DISBURSEMENTS.—The term ‘adjusted disbursements’ means disbursements from the plan reduced by the product of—

“(I) the plan’s funded current liability percentage for the plan year, and

“(II) the sum of the purchases of annuities, payments of single sums, and such other dis-

bursements as the Secretary shall provide in regulations.

“(v) LIQUID ASSETS.—The term ‘liquid assets’ means cash, marketable securities and such other assets as specified by the Secretary in regulations.

“(vi) QUARTER.—The term ‘quarter’ means, with respect to any required installment, the 3-month period preceding the month in which the due date for such installment occurs.

“(F) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out this paragraph.

**“(6) FISCAL YEARS AND SHORT YEARS.—**

“(A) FISCAL YEARS.—In applying this subsection to a plan year beginning on any date other than January 1, there shall be substituted for the months specified in this subsection, the months which correspond thereto.

“(B) SHORT PLAN YEAR.—This subsection shall be applied to plan years of less than 12 months in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

**“(g) IMPOSITION OF LIEN WHERE FAILURE TO MAKE REQUIRED CONTRIBUTIONS.—**

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a plan to which this section applies, if—

“(A) any person fails to make a required installment under subsection (f) or any other payment required under this section before the due date for such installment or other payment, and

“(B) the unpaid balance of such installment or other payment (including interest), when added to the aggregate unpaid balance of all preceding such installments or other payments for which payment was not made before the due date (including interest), exceeds \$1,000,000,

then there shall be a lien in favor of the plan in the amount determined under paragraph (3) upon all property and rights to property, whether real or personal, belonging to such person and any other person who is a member of the same controlled group of which such person is a member.

“(2) PLANS TO WHICH SUBSECTION APPLIES.—This subsection shall apply to a CSEC plan for any plan year for which the funded current liability percentage of such plan is less than 100 percent. This subsection shall not apply to any plan to which section 4021 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 does not apply (as such section is in effect on the date of the enactment of the Retirement Protection Act of 1994).

“(3) AMOUNT OF LIEN.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the amount of the lien shall be equal to the aggregate unpaid balance of required installments and other payments required under this section (including interest)—

“(A) for plan years beginning after 1987, and

“(B) for which payment has not been made before the due date.

**“(4) NOTICE OF FAILURE; LIEN.—**

“(A) NOTICE OF FAILURE.—A person committing a failure described in paragraph (1) shall notify the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation of such failure within 10 days of the due date for the required installment or other payment.

“(B) PERIOD OF LIEN.—The lien imposed by paragraph (1) shall arise on the due date for

the required installment or other payment and shall continue until the last day of the first plan year in which the plan ceases to be described in paragraph (1)(B). Such lien shall continue to run without regard to whether such plan continues to be described in paragraph (2) during the period referred to in the preceding sentence.

“(C) CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.—Any amount with respect to which a lien is imposed under paragraph (1) shall be treated as taxes due and owing the United States and rules similar to the rules of subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 4068 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 shall apply with respect to a lien imposed by subsection (a) and the amount with respect to such lien.

“(5) ENFORCEMENT.—Any lien created under paragraph (1) may be perfected and enforced only by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, or at the direction of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, by any contributing employer (or any member of the controlled group of the contributing employer).

“(6) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) DUE DATE; REQUIRED INSTALLMENT.—The terms ‘due date’ and ‘required installment’ have the meanings given such terms by subsection (f), except that in the case of a payment other than a required installment, the due date shall be the date such payment is required to be made under this section.

“(B) CONTROLLED GROUP.—The term ‘controlled group’ means any group treated as a single employer under subsections (b), (c), (m), and (o) of section 414.

“(h) CURRENT LIABILITY.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘current liability’ means all liabilities to employees and their beneficiaries under the plan.

“(2) TREATMENT OF UNPREDICTABLE CONTINGENT EVENT BENEFITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), any unpredictable contingent event benefit shall not be taken into account until the event on which the benefit is contingent occurs.

“(B) UNPREDICTABLE CONTINGENT EVENT BENEFIT.—The term ‘unpredictable contingent event benefit’ means any benefit contingent on an event other than—

“(i) age, service, compensation, death, or disability, or

“(ii) an event which is reasonably and reliably predictable (as determined by the Secretary).

“(3) INTEREST RATE AND MORTALITY ASSUMPTIONS USED.—

“(A) INTEREST RATE.—The rate of interest used to determine current liability under this section shall be the third segment rate determined under section 430(h)(2)(C).

“(B) MORTALITY TABLES.—

“(i) SECRETARIAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may by regulation prescribe mortality tables to be used in determining current liability under this subsection. Such tables shall be based upon the actual experience of pension plans and projected trends in such experience. In prescribing such tables, the Secretary shall take into account results

of available independent studies of mortality of individuals covered by pension plans.

“(ii) PERIODIC REVIEW.—The Secretary shall periodically (at least every 5 years) review any tables in effect under this subsection and shall, to the extent the Secretary determines necessary, by regulation update the tables to reflect the actual experience of pension plans and projected trends in such experience.

“(C) SEPARATE MORTALITY TABLES FOR THE DISABLED.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (B)—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of plan years beginning after December 31, 1995, the Secretary shall establish mortality tables which may be used (in lieu of the tables under subparagraph (B)) to determine current liability under this subsection for individuals who are entitled to benefits under the plan on account of disability. The Secretary shall establish separate tables for individuals whose disabilities occur in plan years beginning before January 1, 1995, and for individuals whose disabilities occur in plan years beginning on or after such date.

“(ii) SPECIAL RULE FOR DISABILITIES OCCURRING AFTER 1994.—In the case of disabilities occurring in plan years beginning after December 31, 1994, the tables under clause (i) shall apply only with respect to individuals described in such subclause who are disabled within the meaning of title II of the Social Security Act and the regulations thereunder.

“(4) CERTAIN SERVICE DISREGARDED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a participant to whom this paragraph applies, only the applicable percentage of the years of service before such individual became a participant shall be taken into account in computing the current liability of the plan.

“(B) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the applicable percentage shall be determined as follows:

<b>“If the years of participation are:</b>	<b>The applicable percentage is:</b>
1 .....	20
2 .....	40
3 .....	60
4 .....	80
5 or more .....	100.

“(C) PARTICIPANTS TO WHOM PARAGRAPH APPLIES.—This subparagraph shall apply to any participant who, at the time of becoming a participant—

“(i) has not accrued any other benefit under any defined benefit plan (whether or not terminated) maintained by the employer or a member of the same controlled group of which the employer is a member,

“(ii) who first becomes a participant under the plan in a plan year beginning after December 31, 1987, and

“(iii) has years of service greater than the minimum years of service necessary for eligibility to participate in the plan.

“(D) ELECTION.—An employer may elect not to have this subparagraph apply. Such an election, once made, may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary.

“(i) FUNDED CURRENT LIABILITY PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘funded current liability percentage’ means, with respect to any plan year, the percentage which—

“(1) the value of the plan’s assets determined under subsection (c)(2), is of

“(2) the current liability under the plan.

“(j) FUNDING RESTORATION STATUS.—Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section—

“(1) NORMAL COST PAYMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a CSEC plan that is in funding restoration status for a plan year, for purposes of section 412, the term ‘accumulated funding deficiency’ means, for such plan year, the greater of—

“(i) the amount described in subsection (a), or

“(ii) the excess of the normal cost of the plan for the plan year over the amount actually contributed to or under the plan for the plan year.

“(B) NORMAL COST.—In the case of a CSEC plan that uses a spread gain funding method, for purposes of this subsection, the term ‘normal cost’ means normal cost as determined under the entry age normal funding method.

“(2) PLAN AMENDMENTS.—In the case of a CSEC plan that is in funding restoration status for a plan year, no amendment to such plan may take effect during such plan year if such amendment has the effect of increasing liabilities of the plan by means of increases in benefits, establishment of new benefits, changing the rate of benefit accrual, or changing the rate at which benefits become nonforfeitable. This paragraph shall not apply to any plan amendment that is required to comply with any applicable law. This paragraph shall cease to apply with respect to any plan year, effective as of the first day of the plan year (or if later, the effective date of the amendment) upon payment by the plan sponsor of a contribution to the plan (in addition to any contribution required under this section without regard to this paragraph) in an amount equal to the increase in the funding liability of the plan attributable to the plan amendment.

“(3) FUNDING RESTORATION PLAN.—The sponsor of a CSEC plan shall establish a written funding restoration plan within 180 days of the receipt by the plan sponsor of a certification from the plan actuary that the plan is in funding restoration status for a plan year. Such funding restoration plan shall consist of actions that are calculated, based on reasonably anticipated experience and reasonable actuarial assumptions, to increase the plan’s funded percentage to 100 percent over a period that is not longer than the greater of 7 years or the shortest amount of time practicable. Such funding restoration plan shall take into account contributions required under this section (without regard to this paragraph). If a plan remains in funding restoration status for 2 or more years, such funding restoration plan shall be updated each year after the 1st such year within 180 days of receipt by the plan sponsor of a certification from the plan actuary that the plan remains in funding restoration status for the plan year.

“(4) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION BY PLAN ACTUARY.—Not later than the 90th day of each plan year of a CSEC plan, the plan actuary shall certify to the plan sponsor whether or not the plan is in funding restoration status



for the plan year, based on the plan's funded percentage as of the beginning of the plan year. For this purpose, the actuary may conclusively rely on an estimate of—

“(A) the plan's funding liability, based on the funding liability of the plan for the preceding plan year and on reasonable actuarial estimates, assumptions, and methods, and

“(B) the amount of any contributions reasonably anticipated to be made for the preceding plan year.

Contributions described in subparagraph (B) shall be taken into account in determining the plan's funded percentage as of the beginning of the plan year.

“(5) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) FUNDING RESTORATION STATUS.—A CSEC plan shall be treated as in funding restoration status for a plan year if the plan's funded percentage as of the beginning of such plan year is less than 80 percent.

“(B) FUNDED PERCENTAGE.—The term ‘funded percentage’ means the ratio (expressed as a percentage) which—

“(i) the value of plan assets (as determined under subsection (c)(2)), bears to

“(ii) the plan's funding liability.

“(C) FUNDING LIABILITY.—The term ‘funding liability’ for a plan year means the present value of all benefits accrued or earned under the plan as of the beginning of the plan year, based on the assumptions used by the plan pursuant to this section, including the interest rate described in subsection (b)(5)(A) (without regard to subsection (b)(5)(B)).

“(D) SPREAD GAIN FUNDING METHOD.—The term ‘spread gain funding method’ has the meaning given such term under rules and forms issued by the Secretary.

“(E) PLAN SPONSOR.—The term ‘plan sponsor’ means, with respect to a CSEC plan, the association, committee, joint board of trustees, or other similar group of representatives of the parties who establish or maintain the plan.”.

(b) CSEC PLANS.—Section 413 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) CSEC PLANS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in the case of a CSEC plan—

“(1) FUNDING.—The requirements of section 412 shall be determined as if all participants in the plan were employed by a single employer.

“(2) APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.—Paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (5) of subsection (c) shall apply.

“(3) DEDUCTION LIMITATIONS.—Each applicable limitation provided by section 404(a) shall be determined as if all participants in the plan were employed by a single employer. The amounts contributed to or under the plan by each employer who maintains the plan (for the portion of the taxable year included within a plan year) shall be considered not to exceed such applicable limitation if the anticipated employer contributions for such plan year of all employers (determined in a reasonable manner not inconsistent with regulations prescribed by the Secretary) do not exceed such limitation. If such anticipated contributions exceed such limitation, the portion of each such employer's contributions which is not deductible under section 404 shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

“(4) ALLOCATIONS.—Allocations of amounts under paragraph (3) and subsection (c)(5) among the employers maintaining the plan shall not be inconsistent with the regulations prescribed for this purpose by the Secretary.”.

(c) SEPARATE RULES FOR CSEC PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 412(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting “, and”, and by inserting at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

“(D) in the case of a CSEC plan, the employers make contributions to or under the plan for any plan year which, in the aggregate, are sufficient to ensure that the plan does not have an accumulated funding deficiency under section 433 as of the end of the plan year.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 412 of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “multiemployer plan” in paragraph (A) of subsection (a)(2), in clause (i) of subsection (c)(1)(B), the first place it appears in clause (i) of subsection (c)(1)(A), and the last place it appears in paragraph (2) of subsection (d), and inserting “multiemployer plan or a CSEC plan”,

(B) by striking “430(j)” in paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting “430(j) or under section 433(f)”,

(C)(i) by striking “and” at the end of clause (i) of subsection (c)(1)(B),

(ii) by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) of subsection (c)(1)(B) and inserting “, and”, and

(iii) by inserting the following new clause after clause (ii) of subsection (c)(1)(B):

“(iii) in the case of a CSEC plan, the funding standard account shall be credited under section 433(b)(3)(C) with the amount of the waived funding deficiency and such amount shall be amortized as required under section 433(b)(2)(C).”.

(D) by striking “under paragraph (1)” in clause (i) of subsection (c)(4)(A) and inserting “under paragraph (1) or for granting an extension under section 433(d)”,

(E) by striking “waiver under this subsection” in subparagraph (B) of subsection (c)(4) and inserting “waiver under this subsection or an extension under 433(d)”,

(F) by striking “waiver or modification” in subclause (I) of subsection (c)(4)(B)(i) and inserting “waiver, modification, or extension”,

(G) by striking “waivers” in the heading of subsection (c)(4)(C) and of clause (ii) of subsection (c)(4)(C) and inserting “waivers or extensions”,

(H) by striking “section 431(d)” in subparagraph (A) of subsection (c)(7) and in paragraph (2) of subsection (d) and inserting “section 431(d) or section 433(d)”,

(I) by striking “and” at the end of subclause (I) of subsection (c)(4)(C)(i) and inserting “or the accumulated funding deficiency under section 433, whichever is applicable”,

(J) by striking “430(e)(2)” in subclause (II) of subsection (c)(4)(C)(i) and inserting “430(e)(2) or 433(b)(2)(C), whichever is applicable, and”,

(K) by adding immediately after subclause (II) of subsection (c)(4)(C)(i) the following new subclause:

“(III) the total amounts not paid by reason of an extension in effect under section 433(d).”, and

(L) by striking “for waivers of” in clause (ii) of subsection (c)(4)(C) and inserting “for waivers or extensions with respect to”.

(3) BENEFIT RESTRICTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (29) of section 401(a) of such Code is amended by striking “multiemployer plan” and inserting “multiemployer plan or a CSEC plan”.

(B) CONFORMING CHANGE.—Subsection (a) of section 436 of such Code is amended by striking “single-employer plan” and inserting “single-employer plan (other than a CSEC plan)”.

(4) BENEFIT INCREASES.—Subparagraph (C) of section 401(a)(33) of such Code is amended by striking “multiemployer plans” and in-

serting “multiemployer plans or CSEC plans”.

(5) LIQUIDITY SHORTFALLS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 401(a)(32) of such Code is amended by striking “430(j)(4)” each place it appears and inserting “430(j)(4) or 433(f)(5)”.

(B) PERIOD OF SHORTFALL.—Subparagraph (C) of section 401(a)(32) of such Code is amended by striking “430(j)(3) by reason of section 430(j)(4)(A) thereof” and inserting “430(j)(3) or 433(f) by reason of section 430(j)(4)(A) or 433(f)(5), respectively”.

(6) DEDUCTION LIMITS.—Subsection (o) of section 404 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) CSEC PLANS.—Solely for purposes of this subsection, a CSEC plan shall be treated as though section 430 applied to such plan and the minimum required contribution for any plan year shall be the amount described in section 412(a)(2)(D).”.

(7) SECTION 420.—Paragraph (5) of section 420(e) of such Code is amended by striking “section 430” each place it appears and inserting “sections 430 and 433”.

(8) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 4971.—

(A) Subsection (a) of section 4971 of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(3) in the case of a CSEC plan, 10 percent of the CSEC accumulated funding deficiency as of the end of the plan year ending with or within the taxable year.”.

(B) Subsection (b) of section 4971 of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (1), by adding “or” at the end of paragraph (2), and by inserting immediately after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) a tax is imposed under subsection (a)(3) on any CSEC accumulated funding deficiency and the CSEC accumulated funding deficiency is not corrected within the taxable period.”, and

(ii) by striking “minimum required contributions or accumulated funding deficiency” and inserting “minimum required contribution, accumulated funding deficiency, or CSEC accumulated funding deficiency”.

(C) Subsection (c) of section 4971 of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “accumulated funding deficiency” each place it appears in paragraph (2) and inserting “accumulated funding deficiency or CSEC accumulated funding deficiency”,

(ii) by striking “accumulated funding deficiency or unpaid minimum required contribution” each place it appears in paragraph (3) and inserting “accumulated funding deficiency, CSEC accumulated funding deficiency, or unpaid minimum required contribution”, and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) CSEC ACCUMULATED FUNDING DEFICIENCY.—The term ‘CSEC accumulated funding deficiency’ means the accumulated funding deficiency determined under section 433.”.

(D) Paragraph (1) of section 4971(d) of such Code is amended by striking “accumulated funding deficiency or unpaid minimum required contribution” and inserting “accumulated funding deficiency, CSEC accumulated funding deficiency, or unpaid minimum required contribution”.

(E) Subsection (f) of section 4971 of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “430(j)(4)” in paragraph (1) and inserting “430(j)(4) or 433(f)”,

(ii) by striking “430(j)” in paragraph (1)(B) and inserting “430(j) or 433(f), whichever is applicable”, and

(iii) by striking “412(m)(5)” in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting “430(j) or 433(f), whichever is applicable”.

(9) EXCISE TAX ON FAILURE TO ADOPT FUNDING RESTORATION PLAN.—Section 4971 of such Code is amended by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i), and by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

“(h) FAILURE OF A CSEC PLAN SPONSOR TO ADOPT FUNDING RESTORATION PLAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a CSEC plan that is in funding restoration status (within the meaning of section 433(j)(5)(A)), there is hereby imposed a tax on the failure of such plan to adopt a funding restoration plan within the time prescribed under section 433(j)(3).

“(2) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of the tax imposed under paragraph (1) with respect to any plan sponsor for any taxable year shall be the amount equal to \$100 multiplied by the number of days during the taxable year which are included in the period beginning on the day following the close of the 180-day period described in section 433(j)(3) and ending on the day on which the funding restoration plan is adopted.

“(3) WAIVER BY SECRETARY.—In the case of a failure described in paragraph (1) which the Secretary determines is due to reasonable cause and not to willful neglect, the Secretary may waive a portion or all of the tax imposed by such paragraph.

“(4) LIABILITY FOR TAX.—The tax imposed by paragraph (1) shall be paid by the plan sponsor (within the meaning of section 433(j)(5)(E)).”.

(10) REPORTING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 6059(b) of such Code is amended by striking “430,” and inserting “430, the accumulated funding deficiency under section 433.”.

(B) ASSUMPTIONS.—Subparagraph (B) of section 6059(b)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “430(h)(1) or 431(c)(3)” and inserting “430(h)(1), 431(c)(3), or 433(c)(3)”.

#### SEC. 203. ELECTION NOT TO BE TREATED AS A CSEC PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 414(y) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 201, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) ELECTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a plan falls within the definition of a CSEC plan under this subsection (without regard to this paragraph), such plan shall be a CSEC plan unless the plan sponsor elects not later than the close of the first plan year of the plan beginning after December 31, 2013, not to be treated as a CSEC plan. An election under the preceding sentence shall take effect for such plan year and, once made, may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary.

“(B) SPECIAL RULE.—If a plan described in subparagraph (A) is treated as a CSEC plan, section 104 of the Pension Protection Act of 2006, as amended by the Preservation of Access to Care for Medicare Beneficiaries and Pension Relief Act of 2010, shall cease to apply to such plan as of the first date as of which such plan is treated as a CSEC plan.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply as of the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4275.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4275, the Cooperative and Small Employer Charity Pension Flexibility Act.

Madam Speaker, like most Members of this body, I meet with charities, schools, and cooperatives throughout my district on a routine basis when I am back home in Indiana. I often ask them what Washington can do to facilitate their mission or ask about the obstacles that they face when trying to serve their communities. To my surprise, frequently over this past year, their answers revolve around the uncertainty and the burden of their pension funding requirements.

This was somewhat of a shock to me, but I soon found out that some charities, schools, and cooperatives are actually shutting down summer camps, cutting back on services to the community, or raising prices just to meet their pension obligations. And for what? To protect the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation because their plans are unsustainable or underfunded? No. It is because they will soon be lumped into more onerous funding requirements found in the Pension Protection Act, known as the PPA, and are making decisions today that reflect that assumption.

In fact, Congress has already exempted these organizations and found that multiple employer cooperative and charity plans have unique missions, limited participation, and sufficient precautionary safeguards, and that, by design, pose little risk that they will be unable to pay benefits in the future.

Unfortunately, this exemption is set to expire soon and will require pension providers to unnecessarily overfund their plans, rather than using those funds to support services to our communities.

If this were allowed to happen, the results could be catastrophic. For instance, in my home State of Indiana, rural electric cooperatives alone could be forced to needlessly increase their pension contributions by up to 50 percent, costing them \$12.7 million a year and adversely affecting over 1,800 employees in Indiana alone.

Now, it is no secret that the PBGC is facing significant problems that require a comprehensive solution, and I applaud Dr. ROE, Chairman KLINE, and Ranking Member MILLER for their leadership on this issue. The bill, however, only affects 30 plans and just over 127,000 active employees, and the very design of the plan shelters the PBGC from almost all risk. However, without

this bill, some Christian schools or some United Way chapters across the Nation will be forced to meet costly regulations directed toward at-risk, single-employer plans.

Madam Speaker, forcing charities to overfund their already solvent plans is not only wrong from an actuarial standpoint, but from a moral one, as well. For instance, Jewish Federations across the United States don't needlessly overfund their pensions when that money could be going to their mission of providing urgent support for Jews in Ukraine or possibly helping Holocaust survivors age with dignity. These are the types of consequences that are going to take place if we don't pass this bill.

And subjecting rural telecom companies to PPA rules would force them to shift funds from critical services and hurt their ability to provide pension benefits to their current workers.

Our bill injects certainty and sensibility into the multiple-employer pension world by simply allowing plans that are already exempted from the PPA the flexibility to stay excluded permanently or elect into the PPA structure if they wish to do so. That is why it is called “flexibility.”

This bill helps cooperatives, schools, and charities do what they do best: provide quality services that enrich our communities and our lives. This is something that government cannot do, and it is something we need to help facilitate.

I urge all of our colleagues to support the Cooperative and Small Employer Charity Pension Flexibility Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the committee for bringing this bill to the floor and for Congresswoman BROOKS' explanation of this legislation, the Cooperative and Small Employer Charity Pension Flexibility Act.

As she has detailed, this is a small piece of legislation, but a very important piece of legislation to the existence of these plans and also to the priorities of the nonprofits that support those plans and the work that they do in our communities. And what has become clear is that we need this congressional action because the temporary exemption is going to expire, and that would cause a hardship that Congresswoman BROOKS has laid out.

Without these changes, these plans, known as CSEC plans, will be forced to comply with Pension Protection Act funding rules, and many small, non-profit employers will be unable to continue to provide those pension benefits.

This legislation ensures that charities and cooperative associations will continue to be able to provide quality

pension benefits to their employees by implementing pension funding rules that reflect the unique design of their plans.

H.R. 4275 is supported by a wide variety of charitable organizations from across the country, including the United Way Worldwide and Girl Scouts of America and many others, and I would urge our colleagues to support this legislation so that we can make sure that these plans can continue to provide the benefits for their employees but also provide the services to their communities.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. I yield as much time as he might consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

Mr. KLINE. I thank the gentlelady.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4275. I want to thank my colleague, Representative SUSAN BROOKS, for sponsoring the legislation and for her work on this important issue, and my friend and colleague, Mr. MILLER, for his strong support.

In recent years, Congress provided a limited number of charities and eligible cooperatives temporary exemption from Federal pension requirements. Our intent was to offer relief to those who faced unsustainable pension obligations. It is now time to provide the certainty and flexibility necessary to plan for the future.

Without that certainty, important organizations, such as the Girl Scouts of Minnesota and Wisconsin River Valleys, would have to cut back services and support fewer young women. Without that certainty, farmers would face the prospect of raising food and dairy prices to help make ends meet. Without that certainty, religious charities would be hampered in their ability to serve local communities. And without that certainty, Madam Speaker, utility companies providing electricity to homes and businesses would have to consider raising rates just to meet their pension obligations.

That is precisely the reality we now confront. We have a duty to enact responsible rules that provide certainty and protect the pension benefits of workers and retirees. The bill before us today is an attempt to do just that.

This bill would provide certain multiple-employer pension plans greater flexibility to manage their obligations in a way that supports the goods and services their participants need to deliver.

Again, I want to thank my friend and colleague, Mrs. BROOKS, for her leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I would like to thank my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) for co-leading this important effort with me. He has worked tirelessly in championing and raising awareness

about this issue. Without his work, we would not be here today, and I thank him for his passion and his expertise on this difficult subject.

Congress faces many difficult challenges, but the fact that we can come together in a bipartisan way to craft solutions for our country should be the norm and not the exception for this body. I hope this will set an example for what we can accomplish when we put partisan bickering aside. I know there are other pressing issues we can work on together to move our Nation forward.

In closing, I would just encourage my colleagues to support this common-sense bill that will save taxpayers money, enhance communities across America, and encourages co-ops and so many charities to continue to provide their employees with economic security in retirement.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4275.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 6:30 p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3060, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1813, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

#### SERGEANT WILLIAM MOODY POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3060) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service lo-

cated at 232 Southwest Johnson Avenue in Burleson, Texas, as the "Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 0, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—398

Aderholt	Davis (CA)	Herrera Beutler
Amash	Davis, Danny	Higgins
Amodei	Davis, Rodney	Himes
Bachmann	DeFazio	Holding
Bachus	DeGette	Honda
Barber	Delaney	Horsford
Barletta	DeLauro	Hoyer
Barr	DelBene	Hudson
Barrow (GA)	Denham	Huelskamp
Barton	Dent	Huffman
Bass	DeSantis	Huizenga (MI)
Beatty	DesJarlais	Hultgren
Becerra	Deutch	Hunter
Bentivolio	Diaz-Balart	Hurt
Bera (CA)	Dingell	Israel
Billirakis	Doggett	Issa
Bishop (GA)	Doyle	Jackson Lee
Bishop (NY)	Duffy	Jeffries
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins
Black	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (GA)
Blackburn	Edwards	Johnson (OH)
Blumenauer	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Bonamici	Ellmers	Johnson, Sam
Boustany	Engel	Jolly
Brady (PA)	Enyart	Jones
Braley (IA)	Eshoo	Jordan
Bridenstine	Esty	Joyce
Brooks (AL)	Farenthold	Kaptur
Brooks (IN)	Farr	Keating
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Kelly (IL)
Buchanan	Fincher	Kelly (PA)
Buchon	Fitzpatrick	Kennedy
Burgess	Fleischmann	Kildee
Bustos	Fleming	Kilmer
Butterfield	Flores	Kind
Byrne	Forbes	King (IA)
Calvert	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Cantor	Foster	Kinzinger (IL)
Capito	Fox	Kirkpatrick
Capps	Frankel (FL)	Kline
Capuano	Franks (AZ)	Kuster
Cardenas	Frelinghuysen	Labrador
Carney	Fudge	LaMalfa
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Lamborn
Cartwright	Gallego	Lance
Cassidy	Garamendi	Langevin
Castor (FL)	Garcia	Lankford
Castro (TX)	Gardner	Larsen (WA)
Chabot	Garrett	Larson (CT)
Chaffetz	Gerlach	Latham
Chu	Gibbs	Latta
Cicilline	Gibson	Lee (CA)
Clark (MA)	Gohmert	Levin
Clarke (NY)	Goodlatte	Lewis
Clay	Gosar	Lipinski
Cleaver	Gowdy	LoBiondo
Clyburn	Granger	Loeb
Coble	Graves (GA)	Loftis
Coffman	Graves (MO)	Long
Cohen	Grayson	Lowenthal
Cole	Green, Al	Lowe
Collins (GA)	Green, Gene	Lucas
Collins (NY)	Griffin (AR)	Luetkemeyer
Conaway	Griffith (VA)	Lujan Grisham
Connolly	Grimm	(NM)
Conyers	Guthrie	Lujan, Ben Ray
Cook	Hahn	(NM)
Cooper	Hall	Lummis
Cotton	Hanabusa	Lynch
Courtney	Hanna	Maffei
Cramer	Harper	Maloney,
Crawford	Harris	Carolyn
Crenshaw	Hartzler	Maloney, Sean
Crowley	Hastings (FL)	Marino
Cuellar	Hastings (NV)	Massie
Culberson	Heck (WA)	Matheson
Cummings	Heck (WA)	Matsui
Daines	Hensarling	McAllister

McCarthy (CA) Pompeo  
 McCaul Posey  
 McClintock Price (GA)  
 McCollum Price (NC)  
 McDermott Quigley  
 McGovern Rahall  
 McHenry Rangel  
 McIntyre Reed  
 McKeon Reichert  
 McKinley Renacci  
 McMorris Ribble  
 Rodgers Rice (SC)  
 McNerney Richmond  
 Meadows Rigell  
 Meehan Roby  
 Meeks Roe (TN)  
 Meng Rogers (AL)  
 Messer Rogers (KY)  
 Mica Rogers (MI)  
 Michaud Rokita  
 Miller (FL) Rooney  
 Miller (MI) Ros-Lehtinen  
 Miller, George Roskam  
 Moore Ross  
 Mullin Rothfus  
 Mulvaney Royce  
 Murphy (FL) Ruiz  
 Murphy (PA) Runyan  
 Nadler Ruppersberger  
 Napolitano Ryan (OH)  
 Neal Ryan (WI)  
 Negrete McLeod Salmon  
 Neugebauer Sánchez, Linda  
 Noem T.  
 Nolan Sanchez, Loretta  
 Nugent Sanford  
 Nunes Sarbanes  
 Nunnelee Scalise  
 O'Rourke Schakowsky  
 Owens Schiff  
 Palazzo Schneider  
 Pallone Schock  
 Pascarell Schrader  
 Paulsen Schweikert  
 Payne Scott (VA)  
 Pearce Scott, Austin  
 Pelosi Scott, David  
 Perlmutter Sensenbrenner  
 Perry Serrano  
 Peters (CA) Sessions  
 Peters (MI) Sewell (AL)  
 Peterson Shea-Porter  
 Petri Sherman  
 Pittenger Shimkus  
 Pitts Shuster  
 Pocan Sinema  
 Poe (TX) Sires

## NOT VOTING—33

Benishek Gutierrez  
 Brady (TX) Hinojosa  
 Broun (GA) Holt  
 Brownley (CA) Kingston  
 Camp Marchant  
 Campbell McCarthy (NY)  
 Carter Miller, Gary  
 Costa Moran  
 Duckworth Olson  
 Gingrey (GA) Pastor (AZ)  
 Grijalva Pingree (ME)

## □ 1857

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE MARCH 22, 2014, LANDSLIDE IN WASHINGTON STATE

(Ms. DELBENE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday morning, a devastating natural disaster struck near the towns of Oso and Darrington in Washington State, where a hillside collapsed in a

massive landslide, wiping out an entire neighborhood. At least eight lives have been lost already, with dozens and dozens more reported missing. The scale of damage and loss caused by this disaster is truly heartbreaking.

After spending time in the affected communities and in local emergency command centers over the weekend, I am inspired by the spirit, courage, and cooperation of everyone in these communities. I have seen the bravery of all of our first responders who have risked their own lives to save others and continue to do so selflessly.

As search and rescue efforts continue, tonight I ask my colleagues and those around the country to keep the victims, their families, and all those affected by this tragedy in your thoughts and prayers.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from the Washington delegation and I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in honor of all those that we have lost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will now observe a moment of silence.

## □ 1900

## LANCE CORPORAL DANIEL NATHAN DEYARMIN POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1813) to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 162 Northeast Avenue in Tallmadge, Ohio, as the “Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin Post Office Building”, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 0, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

## YEAS—393

Aderholt	Blackburn	Capuano
Amash	Blumenauer	Carney
Amodei	Bonamici	Carson (IN)
Bachmann	Boustany	Cartwright
Bachus	Brady (PA)	Cassidy
Barber	Braley (IA)	Castor (FL)
Barletta	Bridenstine	Castro (TX)
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Chabot
Barrow (GA)	Brooks (IN)	Chaffetz
Barton	Brown (FL)	Chu
Bass	Buchanan	Cicilline
Beatty	Bucshon	Clark (MA)
Becerra	Burgess	Clarke (NY)
Bentivolio	Bustos	Clay
Bera (CA)	Butterfield	Cleaver
Bilirakis	Byrne	Clyburn
Bishop (GA)	Calvert	Coble
Bishop (NY)	Cantor	Coffman
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Cohen
Black	Capps	Cole
		Collins (GA)
		Collins (NY)
		Conaway
		Connolly
		Conyers
		Cook
		Cooper
		Cotton
		Courtney
		Cramer
		Crawford
		Crenshaw
		Crowley
		Cuellar
		Culberson
		Cummings
		Daines
		Davis (CA)
		Davis, Danny
		Davis, Rodney
		DeFazio
		DeGette
		Delaney
		DeLauro
		DelBene
		Denham
		Dent
		DeSantis
		DesJarlais
		Deutch
		Diaz-Balart
		Dingell
		Doggett
		Doyle
		Duffy
		Duncan (SC)
		Duncan (TN)
		Edwards
		Ellmers
		Engel
		Enyart
		Eshoo
		Esty
		Farenthold
		Farr
		Fattah
		Fincher
		Fitzpatrick
		Fleischmann
		Fleming
		Forbes
		Fortenberry
		Foster
		Fox
		Frankel (FL)
		Franks (AZ)
		Frelinghuysen
		Fudge
		Gabbard
		Gallego
		Garamendi
		Garcia
		Gardner
		Garrett
		Gerlach
		Gibbs
		Gibson
		Goodlatte
		Gosar
		Gowdy
		Granger
		Graves (GA)
		Graves (MO)
		Grayson
		Green, Al
		Griffin (AR)
		Griffith (VA)
		Grimm
		Guthrie
		Hahn
		Hall
		Hanabusa
		Hanna
		Harper
		Harris
		Hartzler
		Hastings (FL)
		Hastings (WA)
		Heck (NV)
		Heck (WA)
		Hensarling
		Herrera Beutler
		Higgins
		Himes
		Holding
		Honda
		Horsford
		Hoyer
		Hudson
		Huelskamp
		Huffman
		Huizenga (MI)
		Hultgren
		Hunter
		Hurt
		Israel
		Issa
		Jackson Lee
		Jeffries
		Jenkins
		Johnson (GA)
		Johnson (OH)
		Johnson, E. B.
		Johnson, Sam
		Jolly
		Jones
		Jordan
		Joyce
		Kaptur
		Keating
		Kelly (IL)
		Kelly (PA)
		Kennedy
		Kildee
		Kilmer
		Kind
		King (IA)
		King (NY)
		Kinzinger (IL)
		Kirkpatrick
		Kline
		Kuster
		Labrador
		LaMalfa
		Lamborn
		Lance
		Langevin
		Lankford
		Larsen (WA)
		Larson (CT)
		Latham
		Latta
		Lee (CA)
		Levin
		Lewis
		Lipinski
		LoBiondo
		Loeb
		Lofgren
		Long
		Lowenthal
		Lowe
		Lucas
		Luetkemeyer
		Lujan Grisham
		(NM)
		Lujan, Ben Ray
		(NM)
		Lummis
		Lynch
		Maffei
		Maloney,
		Carolyn
		Maloney, Sean
		Marino
		Massie
		Matheson
		Matsui
		McAllister
		McCarthy (CA)
		McCauley
		McClintock
		McCollum
		McDermott
		McGovern
		McHenry
		McIntyre
		McKeon
		McKinley
		McMorris
		Rodgers
		McNerney
		Meadows
		Meehan
		Meeks
		Meng
		Messer
		Mica
		Michaud
		Miller (FL)
		Miller (MI)
		Miller, George
		Moore
		Mullin
		Mulvaney
		Murphy (FL)
		Murphy (PA)
		Nadler
		Napolitano
		Neal
		Negrete McLeod
		Neugebauer
		Noem
		Nolan
		Nugent
		Nunes
		Nunnelee
		O'Rourke
		Owens
		Palazzo
		Pallone
		Pascarell
		Paulsen
		Payne
		Pearce
		Pelosi
		Perlmutter
		Perry
		Peters (CA)
		Peters (MI)
		Peterson
		Petri
		Pittenger
		Pitts
		Pocan
		Poe (TX)
		Rahall
		Rangel
		Reed
		Reichert
		Renacci
		Ribble
		Rice (SC)
		Richmond
		Rigell
		Roby
		Roe (TN)
		Rogers (AL)
		Rogers (KY)
		Rogers (MI)
		Rokita
		Rooney
		Ros-Lehtinen
		Roskam
		Ross
		Rothfus
		Royce
		Ruiz
		Runyan
		Ruppersberger
		Ryan (OH)
		Ryan (WI)
		Salmon
		Sánchez, Linda
		T.
		Sanchez, Loretta
		Sanford
		Sarbanes
		Scalise
		Schakowsky
		Schiff
		Schneider
		Schock
		Schrader
		Schweikert
		Scott (VA)
		Scott, Austin
		Scott, David
		Sensenbrenner
		Serrano
		Sessions
		Sewell (AL)
		Shea-Porter
		Sherman
		Shimkus
		Shuster
		Sinema
		Sires
		Slaughter
		Smith (MO)
		Smith (NE)
		Smith (NJ)
		Smith (TX)
		Smith (WA)
		Southerland
		Stewart
		Stivers
		Stockman
		Stutzman
		Swalwell (CA)
		Takano
		Takano
		Terry

Thompson (CA)	Vela	Wenstrup
Thompson (MS)	Velázquez	Westmoreland
Thompson (PA)	Wagner	Whitfield
Tiberi	Walberg	Williams
Tierney	Walden	Wilson (FL)
Tipton	Walorski	Wilson (SC)
Titus	Walz	Wittman
Tonko	Wasserman	Wolf
Turner	Schultz	Womack
Upton	Waters	Woodall
Valadao	Waxman	Yoder
Van Hollen	Weber (TX)	Yoho
Vargas	Webster (FL)	Young (AK)
Veasey	Welch	Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—38

Benishek	Gohmert	Pingree (ME)
Brady (TX)	Green, Gene	Polis
Brown (GA)	Grijalva	Rohrabacher
Brownley (CA)	Gutiérrez	Roybal-Allard
Camp	Hinojosa	Rush
Campbell	Holt	Schwartz
Cárdenas	Kingston	Simpson
Carter	Marchant	Speier
Costa	McCarthy (NY)	Thornberry
Duckworth	Miller, Gary	Tsongas
Ellison	Moran	Visclosky
Flores	Olson	Yarmuth
Gingrey (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	

## □ 1908

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 162 Northeast Avenue in Tallmadge, Ohio, as the 'Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin, Jr., Post Office Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LANCE CORPORAL PHILLIP VINNEDGE POST OFFICE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2391) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5323 Highway N in Cottleville, Missouri as the "Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2391

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. LANCE CORPORAL PHILLIP D. VINNEDGE POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5323 Highway N in Cottleville, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the "Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any references in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the author of the bill.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of a great American hero.

On October 13, 2010, Missouri's Second District lost a fearless young man when Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge made the ultimate sacrifice for his country while serving valiantly during Operation Enduring Freedom in Helmand province, Afghanistan.

Phillip first decided to join the military at the age of 10 after witnessing the tragic events of September 11, and after graduating from Francis Howell Central High School in 2009, Phillip enlisted in the United States Marine Corps.

To those who knew Phillip, his devotion to his country through service and sacrifice came as no surprise. He was always determined to protect family and friends and was a respected leader of humble, quiet, and kind nature who never sought accolades or recognition for his accomplishments. At the end of the day, he was happy just reaching his own personal goals while serving and protecting the country that he loved.

#### □ 1915

In addition to his military service, Phillip was an outstanding person. He always sought exciting adventures and new opportunities, from being a Boy Scout, an Order of the Arrow member, a member of the trap shooting club, a wrestler, a welder, and a skydiver among many other great things. There was no challenge that Phillip would back down from. It is for these fearless and courageous servants like Phillip that we are able to know we are protected and allowed to enjoy freedom and liberty here at home.

Phillip will be greatly missed by all who knew him, but most of all by his family: his parents, David and Julie Vinnedge; and his brothers, Corey and Jason.

However, despite their grief, the Vinnedges continue to work hard to honor the memory of Phillip. Phillip had always wanted to buy and restore an old 1950s pickup truck. Since he never had the chance, his parents bought a 1951 Chevy and dedicated it to their son and other fallen marines. The images of the truck resemble events from Phillip's life and ideas that were important to him. Julie and David Vinnedge now use the truck to promote charities such as Toys for Tots, the Missouri Military Memorial Foundation, and the Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors.

The United States of America owes Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge a priceless debt that we will never be able to fully repay. Therefore, the least I can do as a Representative of the United States Congress, it is my honor to sponsor H.R. 2391, a bill that names the Cottleville Post Office after such a genuine, honest, and great young man and by immortalizing a hero who gave up his life serving a Nation he absolutely loved. I am proud that this legislation will allow the inspiring story of Phillip to continue to be told in Missouri's Second District for a long, long time to come.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 2391, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5323 Highway N in Cottleville, Missouri, as the Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge Post Office.

The measure before us was introduced on June 14, 2013, by my colleague, Representative ANN WAGNER. In accordance with the committee's requirements, the bill before us is cosponsored by all members of the Missouri delegation. H.R. 2391 was reported out of committee by unanimous consent on March 12, 2014.

After graduating from Francis Howell Central High School in 2009, Phillip attended Lewis & Clark Technical School for 2 years. Described as loving life and the challenges it presented, it is no surprise that Phillip enlisted in the United States Marine Corps.

Phillip Vinnedge was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force based at Camp Pendleton in California. In September 2010, Lance Corporal Vinnedge's unit was deployed to Afghanistan. Only a month later, he was tragically killed on October 13, 2010, as his unit was conducting combat operations in the Helmand province region.

While Lance Corporal Vinnedge will always be remembered as a marine who proudly served his country, those who know him best will forever remember him for his courageous and competitive spirit. Lance Corporal Vinnedge leaves behind his loving parents, Dave and Julie Vinnedge, and two brothers, Corey and Jason.

Lance Corporal Vinnedge is the recipient of the Purple Heart, Combat Action Ribbon, National Defense Service Medal, and the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we pass this bill to show honor and appreciation to one of our fallen heroes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment just briefly, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge is among the very first postal

namings of the year. No other postal namings have occurred this entire Congress except these we are considering today for our fallen heroes. It has become clear that the public understands the importance of honoring those who have served in Afghanistan and Iraq, and so we do so today on behalf of the several fallen heroes.

This particular lance corporal, in addition to being from Missouri, deployed from Camp Pendleton in my district with the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, a unit that has seen as a percentage the greatest amount of losses of any unit in the theater of Afghanistan or Iraq. The sacrifice of our marines in this conflict in Afghanistan with not a single body of water anywhere around it says a great deal about the new marines.

When Lance Corporal Vinnedge enlisted, he knew he was joining a force that wasn't waiting for a war in amphibious landing craft, but that in fact had already been and had fought with great distinction in Afghanistan, in addition to Iraq. He went there to serve his country, and he paid the highest cost. That is far too often what is happening around the world.

On behalf of the marines of Camp Pendleton, we have great pride in his service, his commitment, and I am pleased to urge all Members to vote for the passage of the naming of this post office after one of our heroes of this decade. With that, I urge support of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2391.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HHS MANDATES

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, jobs, health care, health insurance, and the First Amendment are all on the line this week when the Supreme Court hears about the threats posed by the Obama administration's HHS mandate. The question is simply this: Can the government use the threat of crippling fines to force the owners of a business to violate their own deeply held beliefs?

Two family-owned businesses that already provide good health coverage for their employees believe they should not be forced to pay for drugs and devices that are potentially life ending. But the Obama administration, which has waived or delayed other ObamaCare mandates, has fought for its HHS mandate all of the way to the Supreme Court. If the administration

gets its way, the good jobs and the health insurance these businesses have provided may be lost and religious freedom will be assaulted.

The First Amendment protects the freedom of Americans to live and work according to their beliefs, and the Supreme Court must uphold that freedom.

#### HOBBY LOBBY V. SEBELIUS

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is a big day for the women of this country. The United States Supreme Court will hear argument in a case called *Hobby Lobby v. Sebelius*.

The Affordable Care Act mandates that employer-provided health care cover all forms of contraception at no cost. However, Hobby Lobby, a for-profit corporation, contends that its "religious beliefs prohibit it from providing full coverage."

I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what is at stake is not the religious freedom of a corporation but the life and liberty and ability to pursue happiness by our daughters, our sisters, and our mothers.

There is no more crucial right for women and their families than the ability for women to be in control of their own bodies. The decision to use birth control is a conversation for a woman and her physician, not a woman and her boss.

Tomorrow is a big day for the women of this country.

#### COLD WAR II

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Russian bear has roared. Bully Putin has gobbled up the strategic Crimea. The world did little except protest. So the bear eyes more sovereign land as prey.

We should not forget that while the West watched, KGB Colonel Putin invaded Georgia and stole one-third of that nation. The Russians have never left.

Now the persistent, pesky Putin is still hungry, and he wants more. Will it be Ukraine, Moldavia, Belarus, or our NATO ally, Estonia? This is Cold War II. It has begun.

Villain Vladimir holds former Soviet Republics hostage because the Ruskies control their energy. I was in Ukraine when Putin turned off the gas in winter to punish the Ukrainians. It was cold; it was dark.

Let us loosen the noose around the neck of Ukraine. Sell them our oversupply of natural gas. Expedite the permits, development, and delivery of U.S. natural gas. Send the word over there that the gas is coming, the gas is com-

ing. Let the Napoleon of Siberia know he has bitten off more than he can chew by starting Cold War II.

And that's just the way it is.

#### CRISIS IN VENEZUELA

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, last week marked 1 month since Leopoldo Lopez was unjustly arrested in Venezuela for his role in demonstrations against the ineptitude of the Venezuelan Government.

Mr. Lopez is one of the best-known prisoners in Venezuela, but he is not the only one: 121 people remain behind bars; over 2,000 have been detained while the democratic protests continue.

Despite these arrests, despite the hundreds of injured, dozens killed, the demonstrations continue. The voices of reform will not be silenced. Every day, the Venezuelan people are fighting for freedom, pleading for a better future, demanding their basic rights.

While much of our attention has been focused on the events in Ukraine and Russia, few nations are more closely tied to our national interests than Venezuela. The time for America to act is coming.

#### CONGRATULATING JANA FALIC

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to congratulate a dear friend and an incredibly kind and compassionate woman, Jana Falic, the president of Women's International Zionist Organization, WIZO, U.S.A.

This Wednesday, March 26, Jana will be honored at this year's annual WIZO Gala with the prestigious Joseph Handleman Light of Philanthropy Award for her outstanding contributions to securing Israel's future.

Through her time, effort, and generosity, Jana has helped WIZO secure the needs of vulnerable Israelis through assistance, education, and empowerment so that they too can realize the hope of a better tomorrow.

Her philanthropic endeavors are motivated by her deep affection for the democratic Jewish State of Israel and have helped improve the lives of so many children, women, and elderly Israelis.

I can't think of anyone more deserving of this award than Jana Falic, and I only regret that I cannot be there in person to congratulate this good friend of Israel, this good friend of the United States.

Congratulations, Jana.



□ 1930

# TRIBUTE TO REVEREND CLEVE MINTER

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Reverend Cleve Minter, a member of my community, who passed away a few days ago.

Reverend Minter was pastor of the New Mt. Vernon Baptist Church, but also was a great gospel singer, who along with three of his friends—Reverend John Parker, Reverend Mac McCullum, and Reverend William Jenkins—were known fondly as the four heavyweights, and it didn't mean anything to do with size.

I express condolences to his family and church.

# THE HOME HEATING EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE THROUGH TRANSPORTATION ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, President Obama on Friday signed into law H.R. 4076, the Home Heating Emergency Assistance Through Transportation, or HHEATT, Act.

Having heard from so many constituents facing hardship relating to home heating fuel shortages and supply disruptions, I am a proud cosponsor of this bill, which will extend emergency relief to families and businesses during this ongoing crisis.

On February 5, 2014, the U.S. Department of Transportation issued temporary emergency declarations to allow tank truck operators delivering propane and other home heating fuels to drive for longer hours to speed up deliveries to affected States.

Even though spring is officially upon us, demand for home heating fuels remains high as communities across the country continue to endure below average temperatures. The HHEATT Act provides a guaranteed extension of the Department of Transportation's short-term emergency declarations until May 31, 2014.

I am pleased the Senate followed the House and took immediate action on this emergency legislation that will alleviate propane supply disruptions and get fuel to those who need it most.

# RECOGNIZING MATTHEW RUMENAPP

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to recognize a very special 7-year-old. He is none other than Mat-

thew Rumenapp of Wynantskill, New York. Matty is one of two Winning Kids who have been designated and selected by the Epilepsy Foundation of Northeastern New York to represent all children with epilepsy during the coming year.

Matty is the son of Amy and Derrick Rumenapp. Their 7-year-old attends first grade at St. Jude the Apostle School in Wynantskill and was diagnosed with epilepsy when he was only 2½ years old.

After 3 months of bravely battling the disease, Matty became seizure free and, to this day, remains so. His courage, positive attitude, and lively spirit gives strength to his schoolmates, his teachers, his sister, his parents, and me.

This evening, I salute Matty's bravery and courage, as well as the strength of his entire family. As a Winning Kid, Matty will help others fight seizures and work to find a cure.

# 2014 NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, did you know that, today, each American farmer feeds more than 144 people? In 1960, that same farmer fed only 25 people. Clearly, American agriculture is doing more and doing it better. As the world population continues to grow, there will be an even greater demand for food produced in the United States.

Tomorrow, March 25, marks the 41st anniversary of National Agriculture Day, sponsored by the Agriculture Council of America. The day represents a nationwide effort to educate Americans in classrooms and communities across the country on the importance of our family farmers, their contribution to our Nation's agriculture heritage and legacy, and how the industry impacts each and every one of us for the better.

Farming and agriculture are a crucial part of our economy, especially in Maryland, in the 1st Congressional District. It is the number one economic industry in our State, totaling \$2.3 billion in gross sales. Not surprisingly, poultry makes up the largest component in Maryland, supporting 24,000 jobs.

So as we recognize the efforts of these hardworking American families tomorrow, please be sure to take the time on National Agriculture Day to thank a farmer.

# RENAMING THE NEWTOWN BYPASS TO THE BRIAN S. GREGG MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, in my district in Pennsylvania, the New-

town bypass will be renamed, on April 22, the Brian S. Gregg Memorial Highway, in honor of a Newtown Borough police officer who lost his life in the line of duty on September 29, 2005.

Officer Gregg was 45, a husband and a father. Throughout a police career that began in 2003, Officer Gregg demonstrated his dedication to the Newtown community and its residents with his earnest and daily commitment to their protection.

Always professional in the performance of his duties, Officer Gregg was a familiar and friendly face in the borough. His presence and his service is missed.

Now, as we recognize the great sacrifice made by Officer Gregg and his family, we are also grateful as a wider community for the commitment we see reflected in the daily work of police officers and first responders everywhere.

# WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTEGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

# GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the subject of our Special Order hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, this month is Women's History Month, and the Congressional Black Caucus is pleased to come during this Special Order hour to bring attention to the important issues that particularly face women this month, but we shouldn't be fighting for equality just 1 month out of the year.

It is a constant effort. We are here tonight to encourage everyone to get engaged in making equality a reality.

As President Obama made clear during his State of the Union Address, when women succeed, America succeeds. So tonight, we, the Congressional Black Caucus, gather to discuss the ways in which we can help women succeed, rather than continuing to turn back the clock on women's rights.

I am pleased to start this hour with our chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the person who brings these issues forward each and every day on behalf of her constituents in Ohio and on behalf of constituents all across America, the gentlelady from Ohio, Representative FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank Congressman JEFFRIES and HORSFORD for organizing this Special Order hour to celebrate Women's History Month.

Throughout the month of March, we highlight the important role women

have played—and continue to play—in our Nation's history, a role too often overlooked.

My home State of Ohio has had a dynamic group of women who have changed the face of the State and of this country. There are countless areas influenced by women, including access to education and participation in our country's democracy.

Ohio women have made great strides in breaking down barriers. In fact, the first woman to run for President of the United States was from Ohio. Ms. Victoria C. Woodhull was a writer and women's rights activist. She ran for President in 1872, with the abolitionist Frederick Douglass as her running mate.

While there has yet to be a woman elected President, the number of women in elected offices has grown over the years. However, the rate of growth has been at a less than desirable pace.

Despite the fact that women make up more than 50 percent of the Nation's populous, we are less than 20 percent of the U.S. House of Representatives, where, until 1917, women were not represented at all.

African American women often face compounded discrimination because of our race and gender. As a result, many of our firsts are more recent.

In 1971, Ellen Walker Craig-Jones was the first African American woman elected mayor, by popular vote, for an American municipality, leading Urbancrest, Ohio.

The first African American congresswoman to represent Ohio was my friend and predecessor, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, who was elected in 1998.

While I could go on to detail the important firsts of more women from Ohio and what they have accomplished, there is a better way, and it is legislation.

I am a cosponsor of H.R. 863, the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women's History Museum Act of 2013. The National Women's History Museum would be the first museum to place a national spotlight on the many contributions women have made over the course of our country's history.

More accurately, it is an opportunity to have a permanent place to acknowledge and to celebrate women who have shaped our history and will shape our future.

Women continue to lead national dialogues on critical issues and advance policies and politics in ways that move this Nation forward, including groundbreaking legislation like the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

When we are at the decisionmaking table, we make the discussions more representative of our population, while bringing a unique perspective which expands the conversation.

That is why I will continue to support legislation that will amplify our voices and improve the quality of life for women across our Nation by in-

creasing the minimum wage, investing in quality early childhood education, protecting reproductive rights, and increasing access to high-quality STEM Education.

As we celebrate Women's History Month, let's be mindful of the progress we have made and the work that still needs to be done because when women succeed, America succeeds.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus for your dynamic leadership as the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus. It has been my honor to serve with you this legislative Congressional session and look forward to the many achievements ahead on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, so much of the focus tonight is on the history that women contribute to our great Nation. We have many dynamic women who serve in our delegation in the House of Representatives. It is part of that representation that ensures that these issues that are important to women, as they are important to all Americans, are brought forward.

We have none other than a champion for women in her district in the northern part of California, but also around the world. She is someone who needs no introduction because she brings so much experience and education and knowledge to these issues. I would like to yield now to the gentlelady from California, Representative BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me first thank you, Representative HORSFORD and Congressman JEFFRIES, for organizing the Congressional Black Caucus' Special Order. You have really shown tremendous leadership and consistency and have been working so hard on behalf, not only of your constituents, but for the entire country and especially for the CBC.

Let me just thank, while she is here, our phenomenal chair, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, for her leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus.

As we celebrate women's history and trailblazing women, we celebrate them for their courage, character, and commitment. That is our 2014 Women's History Month theme.

So I am so proud that we have a chairwoman who exhibits all three of these characteristics. Thank you for standing strong and for leading the Congressional Black Caucus on so, so many fronts. Thank you and congratulations.

Let me just say that I agree with Congressman HORSFORD when you say, each month—each day, really—we should always celebrate women's history; though in March, we, again, take a moment to recognize really the triumphs of women throughout the course of history and to mark how far we have come, but also to recognize that there is much work to be done.

Now, let me just start by mentioning the phenomenal and beautiful 89-year-old woman, Mildred Massey, who of

course is my role model. She raised three girls in segregated El Paso, Texas, until desegregation and, at one point, worked three jobs to help take care of her family.

We lived in a multigenerational household and, until his death, was her father's—W.C. Parrish, my grandfather—primary caregiver while working and taking care of her girls.

She taught me at an early age that girls and women are born equal to boys and men and to never forget that and to always fight for equality and justice. That was a given in our household.

□ 1945

I would not be where I am had it not been for my mother and also for many incredible fighters like my mother who came before me in the public arena. I would like to take a moment to honor three women in particular, in addition to my mother, whose shoulders we stand on: Bessie Coleman, Dr. Dorothy Height, and, of course, Shirley Chisholm.

Bessie Coleman, as she was quoted, refused to take "no" for an answer. Although she dreamed of becoming a pilot, no flight school in the United States would accept her simply because she was a woman and because she was Black, but she refused to take "no" for an answer. She enrolled in flight school in France and became the only woman and the only person of color in her class in Paris. She soon became the first African American woman pilot and the first American of any race to hold an international pilot's license.

Several weeks ago, a portion of Airport Drive at the Oakland International Airport, in my district, was renamed "Bessie Coleman Drive." It was such an inspiration to be part of this dedication ceremony because she, of course, was from or worked in Oakland, and really went to many of her classes and learned a lot about piloting in Oakland, California.

Another great woman who refused to take "no" for an answer was our beloved and great doctor, Dorothy Height. Let me just say how fortuitous it is that today is Dr. Height's birthday. She was a bold and brilliant African American woman who blazed many trails and opened many doors to the American Dream for women and people of color.

From her stewardship as the national president of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority—of whom I know our chair, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, and Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY are proud members—to her leading the National Council of Negro Women for 41 years and to her more than 60 years at the YWCA, which she was responsible for desegregating, Dorothy Height dedicated her life to achieving racial equality and securing women's rights. Dr. Height was especially committed to empowering women and girls, and worked to ensure that Black women's issues were equally addressed. She was

also dedicated to helping women work towards full employment, pay, and education.

I remember when Dr. Height turned, I believe it was, 90 years old. Members of the Congressional Black Caucus honored her at a luncheon here on Capitol Hill. She really gave us more background and knowledge and information during that luncheon as to how those following behind her needed to really focus on the fact that, yes, when women succeed, America succeeds. Dorothy Height was a true leader for all women not only in our own country but throughout the world.

In the seventies, Women's History Month was little more than an idea. As this idea was taking formation, Shirley Chisholm, a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus, had only recently made history by becoming the first African American woman elected to Congress. I was a student at Mills College in the early seventies when Mrs. Chisholm again made history by becoming the first African American woman and the first African American to run for the Democratic Presidential nomination. Although she did not win the nomination, her campaign inspired thousands, myself included, to use their voices and to speak up through the ballot box. She blazed the trail for, of course, our Nation's first great President, President Barack Obama.

Throughout her congressional career, the unbought and unbossed Mrs. Chisholm continued her fight against discrimination in all forms and championed issues for women and their families. She was a strong voice for domestic workers and led the fight to give them the right to a minimum wage. This was way back in the day, but we are still struggling and fighting for many of those issues. Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm was instrumental, along with the first Asian Pacific American, our beloved Congresswoman Patsy Mink, in passing title IX, which prohibits discrimination in the funding of education programs. She was also a fierce advocate for the Affordable Child Care Act. There is no doubt that the 16 African American women in Congress today are truly standing on the strong, strong shoulders of Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm.

After years of trying, I am pleased that we were finally able to secure a postage stamp in her honor. Just last month, I was joined by Leader PELOSI in my district for the west coast unveiling of the United States Postal Service's Black Heritage stamp as a small token of our thanks while Congressmen JEFFRIES and RANGEL and Congresswoman CLARKE had the privilege to unveil the beautiful stamp in Shirley Chisholm's former district in Brooklyn, New York.

So 101 years after women marched in Washington, D.C., for the right to vote, women are still fighting to break down barriers. It is really a disgrace that in 2014, despite making up 50 percent of our workforce, women still make, on

average, 77 cents for every dollar a man makes. Even worse, African American women are making only 64 cents and Latinas only 55 cents for every dollar a White man makes. The point is that working women are paid less for the same work as men. This is wrong and it is discriminatory. What is more, child care remains unaffordable; quality, affordable education remains out of the reach of far too many women; and pregnancy discrimination continues. Again, this is simply unacceptable.

That is why the Democratic women of the House, including the women of the CBC, under the leadership of NANCY PELOSI and DONNA EDWARDS and DORIS MATSUI and ROSA DELAURO, have launched When Women Succeed, America Succeeds, and are championing an economic agenda for women and families, one which our President supports.

Finally, let me just quote from my dear friend, our beloved Shirley Chisholm. She once said: I want to be remembered as a woman who dared to be a catalyst for change.

There is no doubt that she was.

As we honor heroines like my mother, Shirley Chisholm, Dorothy Height, Bessie Coleman, and so many others in our districts who fight each and every day with little resources to make our communities better, let us remember that, yes, when women succeed, America succeeds. Also, as I said at the United Nations very recently at the Commission on the Status of Women, when women succeed, the world becomes a more just and a more equitable place.

Thank you for your leadership.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you to the gentlelady from California. Thank you for that great historical overview and perspective and for bringing those profound remarks to the floor this evening.

I would also like to yield to a dynamic colleague. We have had the great honor and privilege to get to know each other as freshmen in this congressional session. She is the gentlelady from Ohio. She brings so much talent and perspective, energy and focus to the issues that she works on here in the House of Representatives on behalf of her constituents and those around the country. I would like to yield now to the gentlelady from Ohio, Representative JOYCE BEATTY.

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you to my colleagues.

I would like to thank Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. JEFFRIES for hosting the Congressional Black Caucus' important discussion on celebrating Women's History Month. As we honor so many women who have shaped our history, let us also celebrate those who make progress in today's time.

Certainly, you will hear throughout this hour, "When Women Succeed, America Succeeds." What an honor it was, Mr. Speaker, to hear our President of these United States say it before an audience of millions of people in his State of the Union address. More

importantly than his saying it is how it was received. People received it in the spirit that he said it. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? It is because, when women succeed, America succeeds.

As you have heard, in 1987, Congress declared March to be National Women's History Month, giving the Nation the chance to salute the trailblazers who paved the way for so many of us to have the rights that we have today. National Women's History Month gives us an opportunity to acknowledge the groundbreakers of the past, thank the heroines of today, and inspire the leaders of the future. It is a reminder that, if we believe in ourselves, we can really make a difference.

It reminds us of women like Rosa Parks—the mother of the modern civil rights movement—or the woman known for: I shall be unbought and unbossed. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Shirley Chisholm, who ran for President and who was the first African American woman elected to Congress, and, yes, Dorothy Height, who, if still living, would have just this week celebrated her 102nd birthday. There are so many more women we could talk about—women of the past or today—like our very own Congressional Black Caucus chairwoman, MARCIA FUDGE, from the great State of Ohio. Others are unknown outside of their own families and communities, people like my grandmother and my great-aunt and like my 90-year-old mother, who lives today and sets a great example, not only for her three daughters, but for women across this Nation. All of them are a part of our history, and their courage and dedication have helped to sustain the American spirit.

These pioneers and heroines have brought down barriers and have created new opportunities. We have now witnessed the first African American woman Secretary of State, the first female Speaker of the United States House of Representatives—a woman I get to sit with on a weekly basis, a woman who sets an example. Yes, she is Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI. There is now a record number of women serving in Congress, with 20 women serving in the Senate and 82 women serving in the House of Representatives. However, although women have made great strides, there is much more to do.

We continue to face discrimination in the workplace. We have a higher risk of sexual assault and an earnings gap that will cost the average woman hundreds of thousands of dollars over the course of her working lifetime. An average woman still makes 77 cents for every dollar made by men, and the gap is even wider for Black women. On average, Black women earn only 64 cents for every dollar earned by White men. In addition, women-owned businesses continue to lag behind male-owned businesses. The average revenue of women-owned businesses is only 27 percent of the average revenue by male-owned businesses.

In response to these and other challenges women are currently facing, in July 2013, House Democrats unveiled “When Women Succeed, America Succeeds: An Economic Agenda for Women and Families.” This platform addresses the need to ensure that women get equal pay for equal work. It helps to ensure work and family balance by allowing working parents to support their families and to care for their children. So many of us in this Chamber understand that. It also recognizes that expanding educational opportunities, increasing job training, and investing in women entrepreneurs is essential for women’s success in our economy.

Federal investments have and continue to help ensure economic opportunities for women and girls. For example, earning a college degree remains one of the surest pathways to the middle class. Women with a bachelor’s degree earn more than 80 percent more than those with a high school degree. Today, more than 11 million women are pursuing a postsecondary education, and average graduation rates for women exceed those of their male counterparts, but we certainly know everyone will not go to college, and that is okay. We have to continue to fight to make sure that there is a place for women in workforce development, in higher education, in the home, or in whatever work they choose to do. Women in STEM fields make, on average, 33 percent more than women in non-STEM fields, and certainly we know that technology and innovation in STEM—science, technology, engineering, and math—is the way of the future.

So let me just say to my colleagues: Thank you for hosting this evening on Women’s History Month. Thank you for honoring women.

To all of the women—the mothers, the sisters, the aunts, the girlfriends—who are watching us: remember, when women succeed, America succeeds.

Thank you.

□ 2000

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative JOYCE BEATTY, for those illuminating topics that were covered, and for highlighting all the various ways, both historically and currently, that women make a huge impact in our society, in the home, in the workplace, in education, and throughout all aspects of life. So thank you, Representative BEATTY, for your ongoing contributions to these important issues.

I am so proud to be joined here by the Representative from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), my coanchor of this hour. I look forward to his remarks.

I want to also highlight in addition to all of the national leaders and women who have run for office, whether it be here in the House of Representatives, in the Senate, or as President, we also have many unsung women who toil everyday but who make a huge impact.

It is only fitting, Mr. Speaker, that during Women’s History Month that I recognize a Nevada leader, an icon, Ms. Ruby Duncan, who is an inspiration in my home State to many.

Ruby to me is the personification of the word fight. She is someone we can all learn from each and every day. Her history is a lesson in never giving up and staring down the specter of inequality. Nothing was ever handed to her, but much was taken.

Ruby’s life began in the middle of the Great Depression. Where she grew up in rural Louisiana, people were already poor for a long time. Ruby had three brothers and a sister, all but one passing from accidents or illnesses. She lost her parents before she was 4. She spent most of her youth moving around Tallulah, living with relatives.

The school that she attended, a school for Black children, was located in a church miles from home. There was no transportation. She walked every day until she left school after the ninth grade for full-time work. Actually, it was more than full-time work. For years she was a waitress making about \$9.50 a week. Yes, that’s right, \$9.50 a week. Her work weeks were long, over 80 hours a week.

When she heard her aunt in Las Vegas was making \$40 for similar work, she moved there. When she arrived, she discovered her aunt living in a cardboard shack in the desert, sharing a community wash house with others. She discovered a de facto segregated community there, separate schools, housing, and zoning in the community resulted in a system of clear disenfranchisement.

Blacks were not welcome at the Las Vegas Strip hotels. There were colored sections designated in movie theaters. Still, Ms. Ruby Duncan persevered. She survived. She did day work as a maid in homes around the area. In 1959 she worked as a hotel maid but was fired later for attempting to organize other maids to protest the inhumane treatment and workload.

For a while her only income for herself and her children was the aid to dependent children grant that she received from the State welfare system. Like those struggling today, she did not rest. She was not lazy; she worked. She searched for work and was hired in the pantry of one of the Strip hotels in Las Vegas.

After an accident, she learned she could no longer do the heavy work that she was performing. When a State program that was supporting her was cut, she was contacted to join a group of mothers going up to Carson City, our State’s capital, to protest substandard grants from the Nevada Legislature.

Ruby marched and spoke at a hearing with no prior experience in public speaking. She did it because someone had to say something for those who were struggling. Someone had to stand up for what was right.

After Mrs. Duncan’s trip to Carson City, she was elected president of the

Clark County Welfare Rights Organization. As president, she led the nationally publicized 1971 marches on the Las Vegas Strip, protesting the purge of thousands of needy Nevada families from programs designed to help the poor and allow them to keep their heads above water.

From that she has fought to provide basic necessities to families in need—food, shelter, health services, and education. Her organization that she created, Operation Life, has had an impact on health screening centers, libraries, food programs for women, infants and children, child care, and the list goes on.

Ruby Duncan represents hope. In a country plagued by inequality and discrimination of the worst forms, Ruby fought and won many decisive battles that affect the lives of so many in Nevada and across this Nation today.

Not everyone wins their battle with poverty. For so many, circumstances beyond their control take over their lives. For many born poor, they stay poor. For many born just above the poverty line, they dip below and enter a cycle of living paycheck to paycheck, if they can even find one.

The poor are not poor because of a weak character. They are not lazy. Many are poor because no one ever gave them a chance. It is people like Ruby Duncan that I am here to represent. The people who had less than a hand up, but they still persevered. She is strong, and she is an inspiration to me, and someone who I wanted to recognize during this recognition of Women’s History Month. Congratulations to Ms. Ruby Duncan.

I would now like to yield to the coanchor for this hour, my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES). It is always great to be here with you, to bring this hour of power of information to the constituents throughout the United States who are listening. I thank you for your friendship, for always working hard, for including me, and it is great to serve with you in this 113th Congress.

I yield to my good friend.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman, my good friend from the Silver State, Representative STEVEN HORSFORD, for his tremendous leadership in anchoring the CBC’s Special Order and for the tremendous advocacy that you have consistently provided to the people of the congressional district you so ably serve back at home in Nevada and indeed to people all across this country.

It has been an honor and a privilege to serve as a coanchor during this CBC Special Order, this hour of power where for 60 minutes members of the Congressional Black Caucus have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people about an issue of great relevance.

Today as you have heard, we today stand here on the floor of the House of Representatives to celebrate the role that women have played throughout

the tapestry of the American people from the beginning of the Republic to where we stand right now in 2014.

Representative BARBARA LEE spoke moments earlier about the Women's History Month theme, involving courage, character, and commitment. As I reflected upon that theme, several individuals came to mind. Certainly when it comes to courage, I think no one meets that threshold in American history perhaps more than the great Harriet Tubman, a conductor on the underground railroad.

Harriet Tubman is someone who displayed tremendous courage throughout her time here in this country. She was known for having a Bible in one hand and a gun in the other. Harriet Tubman freed herself from slavery.

At that point, after settling in New York State she could have simply gone on to try and live out her life with relative tranquility, having escaped the harshness of human subjugation down in the Southern part of this country.

Instead, Harriet Tubman, we know as history records, went back down South an additional 19 times and freed more than 200 Black slaves, risking her life, her well-being, her freedom each and every time she crossed the Mason-Dixon line to try and liberate those who were subjected to slavery in this country.

What is interesting about that life story and the courage that Harriet Tubman displayed, the selflessness and the sacrifice as this prominent conductor on the underground railroad, stations exist in the district that I currently represent in Fort Greene, Brooklyn, at the Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church.

What was tremendous about Harriet Tubman is that later on in life she was apparently asked about her heroics, the sacrifice, the selflessness, the courage, the willingness to risk life and limb to free others after she had already liberated herself. She made an observation that has always stuck with me. Harriet Tubman said: I could have freed more, if they only knew that they were slaves. I could have freed more if they only knew that they were slaves.

That suggests to me that sometimes people who find themselves in life in a certain station and notwithstanding their talents or their ability, the fact that someone has put before them a pathway towards success, an opportunity to move forward in pursuit of the American Dream, that there is something that constrains them and keeps them standing in place.

I have always looked to those words of Harriet Tubman and the great heroism that she displayed as a source of tremendous inspiration and something that should inspire all Americans—Black, White, Latino, Asian, men and women, older Americans, younger Americans—like courage, character and commitment. I certainly think in terms of courageousness you can find no one who had that quality in greater abundance than of course Harriet Tubman.

Now, Representative LEE also referenced Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm. I stand here today proud of the fact that I represent many of the neighborhoods that Congresswoman Chisholm once represented in this Congress.

She was elected in 1968 and became the first African American woman ever elected to the House of Representatives in the history of this great Republic, served seven terms, 14 distinguished years. She retired in 1982. At which point, there were parts of her district that were subsequently represented by Congressman Ed Towns, who served for 30 years in the Congress and whom I had the opportunity to replace.

Then there were other parts of her district subsequently represented by Congressman Major Owens, who served for 26 years and who Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE subsequently represented.

For a great while there was a tremendous debate as to who actually held the legacy of Shirley Chisholm's seat. Well, I think Congresswoman CLARKE and I worked it out. She was such a tremendous Member of the House that it actually takes two Members of Congress to replace her. I proudly acknowledge that I serve in one of the two Shirley Chisholm legacy seats here in the House of Representatives.

Of course when she got elected in 1968 there were some folks in this Chamber not used to seeing an African American woman, with very prominent hair, who was "Unbought and Unbossed," and comes into this Chamber. Tradition says that she was assigned by the Speaker then to the agricultural committee as a punitive measure, because obviously in this urban district that she represented it seems to a lot of folks that appointment to the agricultural committee would not necessarily be the committee of relevant jurisdiction for the issues that she was elected to Congress to fight for.

Shirley Chisholm took that assignment and quickly recognized that while in this country you had surplus, abundance of food that was being created, you also had a lot of hungry folks, many of whom lived in the district that she represented.

□ 2015

So she began to work on expanding the food stamp program and championed, in fact, increasing supplemental nutritional assistance to at-risk, expectant mothers and helped lead the charge in the House of Representatives for the Women, Infants, and Children supplemental nutritional assistance program.

She partnered with then-Senator Bob Dole, who was over on the other side of this Capitol. She took what was meant as a punitive assignment and turned it into something transformative for the people that she represented, as well as those across the country.

So, from a character and a commitment standpoint, she demonstrated,

again, that there is opportunity in the face of adversity. That is what she did here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Earlier today, the League of Women Voters acknowledged Shirley Chisholm for her accomplishments in the district that I represent, in fact, in the Shirley Chisholm State Office Building that I was proud to have authored the legislation, when I was in the New York State Assembly, that transformed that Kings County State Office Building into one named on behalf of Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm.

We stand on the shoulders of a lot of giants, but I certainly acknowledge that I am standing on the shoulders of Representative Shirley Chisholm, as so many folks are all across the city, the State of New York, and certainly this country. She inspired generations of people to believe what was possible.

I was talking to one of the women who, in the seventies, began to work closely with Congresswoman Chisholm, and she explained to me that Shirley Chisholm was such a forceful personality that her group of young women who, in the seventies, she would work closely with, that they were called Shirley Chisholm and the Chisettes.

Sounds to me like a Motown group, but these were transformative individuals, Shirley Chisholm and the Chisettes, who believed, perhaps back then, that when women succeed, America succeeds, and understood that there was still work that needed to be done to shatter the glass ceilings that had been erected all across this country.

Shirley Chisholm did just that in 1972, when she ran for the Democratic nomination for the United States Presidency. What I find fascinating is that her theme at that point was "catalyst for change."

In many ways, this was a prophetic theme, "catalyst for change," because she was that catalyst for a whole lot of things that were to have occurred decade after decade, when she made that first run for office.

As has been mentioned on the floor of the House of Representatives, many could argue that there would not be a President Barack Obama had Shirley Chisholm not taken that bold step forward in 1972.

We have a whole lot of things, of course, that still need to be addressed, and I look forward to dealing with some of those issues.

As has been pointed out, women simply make 77 cents for every dollar that a man makes in America, and that hurts our overall economic productivity because 40 percent of the households in this country, women are the predominant primary breadwinner.

So we have got some economic issues to work out to continue the work that had been done by so many in this country, Shirley Chisholm included, and I look forward to continuing that discussion with Congressman STEVEN HORSFORD.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from New York. Thank you for

that very insightful background on your district and the leadership of the district. It speaks to why there is so much impact that comes from Representatives from your district and the area and the neighborhoods that you represent.

I know that you cannot fully fill those shoes, but you are doing your part in bringing forward the message that so many others carried and that we follow now on their shoulders, so thank you for that historical perspective.

In addition to the historical perspective that women offer in this country, the House Democrats also have a legislative agenda that focuses on when women succeed, America succeeds. It is an economic agenda for women, and it is one that was created by the women in the House Democratic Caucus that is sponsored and supported by men.

As a man, I support this economic agenda for women because, as a husband and a father, I want for every woman what I want for my own wife and my daughter. As a brother and a son, I want for other women what I want for my two sisters and my mother. So this economic agenda for women focuses on a number of areas.

The first, of course, is equal pay for equal work. It is appalling, Mr. Speaker, that in the year 2014, we are still struggling to pay women the wages that they deserve. They are still not receiving equal pay for equal work. That, on its face, is wrong.

Women in my home State of Nevada are paid about 85 cents for every dollar paid to men; and while that is better than the 77-cent national average, we still have a long, long way to go.

As my colleagues have already explained, for African American women and Latinas, this pay gap is even larger. African American women, on average, earn only 64 cents; and Latinas, on average, earn only 55 cents for every dollar earned by White, non-Hispanic men.

In my home State of Nevada, the pay gap between men and women is, on average, \$6,316 per year. Now, that is real money, and it makes a real impact in the lives of families. Nevada women lose approximately \$2 billion per year because of this wage gap.

Now, what can \$6,316 pay for, for families in my home State of Nevada?

\$6,316 is about 46 more weeks of food. \$6,316 per year is 4 more months of mortgage and utility payments. \$6,316 per year is 7 months of rent. \$6,316 per year is an additional 1,681 gallons of gas.

So if we thought that the wage gap was just some rhetoric that was being talked about out there, all you have to look at is the real impact of lost economic benefit to women. If we closed the wage gap between men and women, we could cut the poverty rate in half for working women and their families.

It is the right thing to do, to treat people equally, to pay them equal pay for equal work. That is why 125,000

households in Nevada, who are headed by women, expect this Congress to support the Paycheck Fairness Act, invest in job training and educational opportunities, and make sure that we protect pregnant workers from discrimination in the workplace.

Now, another area that we have to address is raising the minimum wage and giving America a raise.

Mr. Speaker, low-income workers continue to struggle to provide for their families, while the rich continue to make record profits in the millions.

It is important to remember who earns the minimum wage in this country. They are women. Women make up the majority of low-income workers. In fact, nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers are women. These are our mothers. They are our sisters and our daughters.

Can we really expect for women to provide for their families when they are making the minimum wage?

Let's talk about what \$7.25 really means as a national wage for women. That is \$14,500 a year. Can people really survive on \$14,500 a year?

Particularly, more than a majority now of women who are the head of their household, the primary breadwinners, can they provide for themselves and their families on \$14,500 a year?

That is why House Democrats, in this economic agenda for women—when women succeed, America succeeds—we understand that by lifting the Federal minimum wage to \$10.10, that if it were adjusted for inflation, compared to what it was in the 1960s, it would be well past time, Mr. Speaker, to address this pay gap for women.

In addition to increasing the minimum wage to help 1 in 3 adult women who are currently living in poverty or on the brink of it, this would help lift those women out of poverty, helping 30 million Americans see an increase in their wage, a million Americans being lifted out of poverty.

These are the real impacts and the benefits on the economic agenda for women.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, Mr. JEFFRIES, to elaborate further on these points, and then I can close us out.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I want to thank my distinguished colleague for his comprehensive presentation as it relates to the economic trauma that many women find themselves in, given the pay disparities that continue to exist in America.

Mr. Speaker, the President came to the House of Representatives earlier this year to deliver a State of the Union Address and pointed out the fact that women, of course, make 77 cents for every dollar that a man makes and indicated the outrageousness of that in modern-day America.

It is a moral outrage, and for that reason alone, we should seek corrective action by moving forward with the Paycheck Fairness Act here in the Congress.

But aside from it being a moral outrage, as Congressman HORSFORD has pointed out, it has economic consequences. Because 40 percent of households in America are headed by women as the primary breadwinners, if you have such a significant portion of households led economically by individuals who are receiving disparate pay, you are hurting American families.

Now, one of the ways in which we can remedy this situation, of course, is to move forward with H.R. 1010, the minimum wage increase legislation authored in the House of Representatives by Congressman GEORGE MILLER, co-sponsored, of course, by Congressman HORSFORD, myself and many other Democratic Members of the House of Representatives.

We are of the view that both America needs a raise and women in America need a raise. 66 percent of minimum wage earners in this country are women.

Now, the minimum wage in America right now, the floor that is set by Congress, \$7.25 an hour, means that someone can work 40 hours a week, each and every week throughout the year, go to work, and still fall below the Federal poverty line in attempting to raise a family. That is disgraceful, the classic definition of working poor, and it should not exist.

I thought the American ideal was that if you get up for work, you work hard, you punch the clock, that at the end of the day, there should be a pathway toward meaningful success in the context of the American Dream.

Right now, we have got a minimum wage that keeps individuals trapped in poverty, and the overwhelming majority of those individuals are women in America. So when we talk about an agenda that we have put forth—when women succeed, America succeeds—that is not just hyperbole or something designed to make folks feel good. It is an economic reality. That is why we are so committed to that agenda.

We are committed to making sure that child care in America is affordable because of the fact that so many women, thankfully, are part of the workforce; but as a result of their participation in the workforce, they need to find affordable, quality child care for their children.

That is one of the things that we, as House Democrats, continue to try and put forth, and we are just hopeful that our friends on the other side of the aisle will realize that moving forward with an agenda that uplifts women in America honors the great contributions of women in this country, decade after decade, century after century, from the founding of the Republic; but more significantly, will empower women and, in doing so, empower America to continue to forge forward into the future as the greatest Nation in the world.

□ 2030

So I am thankful to my colleague for his leadership tonight in connection



with this Special Order, and I look forward to continuing to work on a progressive Congressional Black Caucus agenda for women, for men, for America, and for our future.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman, my coanchor, for joining me this hour.

Mr. Speaker, as we come to a close, to just highlight some of the major reasons why the Congressional Black Caucus along with the House Democrats believe that, if we are really going to honor the role of women in this country, then we need to start by honoring them through equal pay. We need to honor them through an economic agenda that supports their needs and the needs of their families.

And as my colleagues have already laid out, women now make up half—47 percent—of the general workforce and some 62 percent of the minimum wage workforce, which is up from about 30 percent in the 1950s. Twelve percent of workers in the United States have access to paid family leave through their employers, and fewer than 40 percent have access to personal medical leave through employer-provided short-term disability insurance.

So one of the other cornerstones, in addition to giving women equal pay for equal work, for increasing the minimum wage, is providing a work-family balance by allowing women to be able to take off work when necessary to care for a loved one without losing their earnings and a paycheck.

Laws providing paid family leave and medical leave allow workers to continue to earn a portion of their pay while they take time away from work to address serious health conditions, including pregnancy, to care for a family member with a serious health condition, and to care for a newborn, newly adopted child or a newly placed foster child.

You know, we should be encouraging the growth of strong, healthy families. And so often my colleagues on the other side talk about family values. Well, if you won't pass legislation that allows workers to spend time with their families, then what kind of a family value is that?

Over the average lifetime of a woman, by the age of 65, they will have lost \$431,000 because of the earnings gap. That is something that the House Democrats, along with the Congressional Black Caucus, are working to address. We have legislation, When Women Succeed, America Succeeds, the economic agenda for women that we have laid out here tonight that would close this earnings gap, provide women the support they need to make more, helping their families and helping our economy as a whole.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about Women's History Month, we hope that it will resonate in this Chamber and in the Halls here in Washington that the decisions that we make impact the lives of all of our constitu-

ents. And it is time that women have a fair shot to the full opportunity that this country has to offer, and it starts by providing them with the earnings that they deserve. This is good not only for that woman and her future, but it is good for the family as a whole.

As I said earlier, I want for every woman what I want for my wife and my daughter: to be able to have the same opportunities and to be treated the same way as a man is treated in this country. I want for every woman what I want for my two sisters and my mother: to have the same equal opportunities to pursue their dreams and to be paid the same for pursuing that dream.

So these are the issues that we have laid out tonight, Mr. Speaker. We look forward to continuing to work with our colleagues on the other side. We would like to thank the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Representative FUDGE, and all of the members of the CBC and those who were able to speak tonight. When women succeed, Mr. Speaker, America succeeds.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues with the Congressional Black Caucus in this Special Order in recognition of Women's History Month.

I want to offer a special mention for the U.S. House of Representatives women firsts:

Congresswoman Jeanette Rankin of Montana who was the first elected woman member of the House of Representatives;

Congresswoman Patsy Mink of Hawaii was the first woman of color and the first Asian American woman elected to Congress;

Congresswoman Shirley Anita Chisholm of New York who was the first African-American Congresswoman member of the House of Representatives; and

Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN whom we have the honor of working with is the first Hispanic woman elected to serve in Congress.

National Women's History Month's roots go back to March 8, 1857, when women from New York City factories staged a protest over working conditions.

International Women's Day was first observed in 1909.

In 1981, Congress passed a law authorizing the President to proclaim March 7, 1982 as "Women's History Week." It was a modest beginning, but very significant to women because it started a societal and cultural change in how women—and especially young girls saw themselves within the American story.

In 1987, Congress expanded the week to a month. Every year since, Congress has passed a resolution for Women's History Month, and the President has issued a proclamation.

This month we recognize Women's History Month by noting the fundamental role women have played in shaping America's history. But I say to you that a month is not enough to make known the significant contributions of women to the success of the United States of America.

We taught our girls about Rosie the Riveter who represented the millions of American women who went to work on assembly lines to

manufacture tanks, planes, and weapons for the defense of this nation during World War II.

I am a cosponsor of H.R. 863, the National Women's History Commission Act.

The bill would establish a Commission to study the potential for creating a National Women's History Museum and submit to the President and Congress a report containing recommendations on a plan of action for the establishment and maintenance of a National Women's History Museum in Washington, DC.

Congressional action is needed to be sure that when the story of our nation is told that the role of women is represented in the narrative of our nation.

I along with my colleagues participating in this special order are urging passage of H.R. 863, to study the potential creation of a National Women's History Museum in Washington, DC, on or near the National Mall.

The Shriver Report, "A Woman's Nation Pushes Back from the Brink: Some Recommended Steps for Government, Businesses, and Women" reported on the economic health of the average American woman.

Today, women make up half the U.S. workforce, but the average full time working woman earns only 77 percent of what the average full time working man makes.

There are many women in the State of Texas and in the city of Houston who have made significant contributions to the American story:

Congresswoman Barbara Jordan of Texas was the first African-American woman elected to the House of Representatives;

Kathryn "Kathy" Whitmire was the first woman elected to serve in Houston City government; and

Mae Carol Jemison was the first African-American woman astronaut.

These many accomplishments do not mean there is not more that needs to be done. There is still a long way for women to go according to the Shriver Report.

Women are more than 50 percent of the population and more than 50 percent of the votes.

A woman working full time, all year at a minimum-wage job, or a job close to the minimum wage, will not be able to bring her family above the poverty line. Families need an income closer to 200 percent of the federal poverty threshold to escape the brink.

In the Shriver Report's survey:

73 percent of Americans said that in order to raise the incomes of working women and their families, they strongly favor the government ensuring that women get equal pay for equal work;

79 percent of Americans said the government should expand access to high-quality, affordable childcare for working families;

Almost 60 percent of Americans said women raising children on their own face tremendous challenges and should be helped financially by government, employers, and communities; and

If we are going to win the war on poverty we must wage and win the war of discrimination of women in the workforce.

Pay inequality is not just a women's issue—it is a family income equality issue.

TEXAS LOW WAGE WORKER BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

In 2012, Texas ranked second among the 50 states with workers earning at or below the federal minimum wage.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics of the 6.1 million workers are paid hourly rates in Texas in 2012,

In Texas 282,000 earned exactly the prevailing federal minimum wage of \$7.25 per hour, while 170,000 earned less.

From 2011 to 2012, the number of Texas workers who earned at or below the federal minimum wage was 7.5 percent. The percentage of workers earning less than the federal minimum in 2012 was 2.8 percent, while the share earning exactly the minimum wage was 4.7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to help celebrate Women's History Month by becoming cosponsors of H.R. 863.

#### BY THE NUMBERS

161 million: The number of females in the U.S. as of December 2013. The number of males was 156.1 million.

2 to 1: At 85 and older, the approximate ratio by which women outnumbered men in 2012 (3.9 million to 2.0 million).

#### JOBS

74.8 million: The number of females 16 and older who participated in the civilian labor force in 2012. Women comprised 47.4 percent of the civilian labor force in 2012.

41.6%: Percent of employed females 16 and over in 2012 (annual average) who worked in management, professional and related occupations, compared with 34.7 percent of employed males in the same year (annual average).

#### MILITARY

1.6 million: Number of female veterans in the United States in 2012.

#### EARNINGS

\$37,791: The median annual earnings of women 15 or older who worked year-round, full time in 2012. In comparison, the median annual earnings of men were \$49,398.

77¢: The amount that female year-round, full time workers earned in 2012 for every dollar their male counterparts earned. This ratio was statistically unchanged from 2011.

#### EDUCATION

11.3 million: Number of women college students in fall 2012. Women comprised 56.8 percent of all college students.

31.4: Percent of women 25 and older who had obtained a bachelor's degree or more as of 2012.

25%: Percentage of women 18 and older with an alternative educational credential—such as professional certifications, licenses and educational—not statistically different from men. However, women had higher rates of alternative credentials than men at the bachelor's degree and advanced degree levels.

15%: Among people with advanced degrees, the percentage of women who held educational certificates compared with 12 percent of men; 51 percent of women held professional certifications or licenses compared with 43 percent of men.

#### VOTING

63.7%: Percentage of female citizens 18 and older who reported voting in the 2012 presidential election, in comparison to 59.7 percent of their male counterparts.

#### MOTHERHOOD

85.4 million: Estimated number of mothers in the U.S. in 2009.

1.9: Average number of children that women 40 to 44 had given birth to as of 2010, down

from 3.1 children in 1976, the year the Census Bureau began collecting such data. The percentage of women in this age group who had given birth was 81 percent in 2010, down from 90 percent in 1976.

#### MARRIAGE

66 million: Number of married women 18 and older (including those who were separated or had an absent spouse) in 2013.

5.2 million: Number of stay-at-home mothers nationwide in 2013; compared with 214,000 stay-at-home fathers.

#### THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF ABORTION-INDUCING DRUGS IN OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to share the tale of two garages: the American Dream and the threat to that American Dream.

The first garage is down in Oklahoma, and it is owned by David and his wife Barbara. In 1972, David and Barbara borrowed \$600, and they began making picture frames in their garage. They had a dream. They said, you know: People might want to buy premade frames. There are pictures all the time that people take, and we could do that.

So they enlisted their two sons, Steve and Mart, and they began building those picture frames. And then they opened up a retail location—actually, it was 300 square feet in size—and they started selling those picture frames, and it was very, very successful. And now, their dream has just blossomed into 556 stores in 41 States, and 70 more are scheduled to open this year.

They have now what started out in the garage with just David and Barbara and their two sons, they have 16,000 full-time employees. And we all know that store. I am sure many of us have been there. It is called Hobby Lobby. We love it. It has expanded now not just to picture frames, but all kinds of art and decorating supplies. And their headquarters is actually located just down the street from that garage in Oklahoma City.

The other garage is over in Pennsylvania, and it is owned by Norman and Elizabeth Hahn. They have three sons: Norman, Anthony, and Kevin. And in 1964, about 40 years ago, they, too, had a dream, and they started in their ga-

rage making high-quality doors and wood components for kitchen cabinets. You know, they said: We can do this, so let's do it. So they started working hard and expanding.

And from their modest beginnings in just a small garage in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, they have now grown to be one of the industry leaders in wholesale wood products for kitchen cabinets. They have five facilities located in the United States in three States—Pennsylvania, North Carolina, and Washington—and what started out with five family members, they now have 950 full-time employees. It is truly an encouraging sign that the American Dream is alive and well.

And something else these two garages and these two families—David and Barbara Green as well as Norman and Elizabeth Hahn—have in common is that they care for not only their customers and having a high-quality product, but they also care about their employees. They both have provided a lot of high-quality benefits to their employees, paying them well, and also providing health care for years, as well as other benefits.

But I am sad to say both of these businesses and both of these families are in trouble, and these businesses are in jeopardy of having to close—not because of the economy. Like I said, Hobby Lobby is actually planning to open 70 more stores. There is a need. People want their products. It is not because of any other reason other than, sadly, the government.

The government is threatening these American businesses, what we need more of. They are providing good jobs and are providing health care. They are in jeopardy of closing because our government and our Representatives, a few years ago, passed the President's health care takeover law. And part of that was a mandate that said, if you provide health insurance for your employees, you have to include abortion-inducing drugs. It doesn't matter that you already had a good policy that your employees like; you have to do that. And if you don't, you are going to be fined not just a little bit, but a lot.

I have a poster here I want to show you that shows the injustice of this mandate. You have two numbers here: \$36,500; \$2,000. Here is the situation for these two families:

The ObamaCare law says that if you don't provide health care for your employees, we are going to fine you \$2,000 an employee; but if you do provide health insurance for your employees but just don't include the abortion-inducing drugs, then we are going to fine you \$36,500. Where is the justice in that? Where is the common sense?

I am from Missouri, and we are the Show Me State. Show me how this makes any sense at all. This is the situation that faces the Hahn family and the Green family. They are providing their health insurance coverage. They are conscientious. Due to their beliefs, they believe that all life is valuable,

and they don't want to be complicit in paying for potentially life-ending drugs. And because of that, our government is going to fine them this amount of money, \$36,500 per employee, which, sadly, could put both businesses out of work. We would have tens of thousands of people across this country out of work just because of this government takeover of health care. It is wrong.

We have a long-standing tradition in this country of following something in here. It is in the Constitution. It is an amazing little document that our Founders started. But you know the very first amendment to the Constitution establishing our rights is that it lays out the importance of religious liberty. It says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Our country has always upheld religious freedom and the right to exercise and live according to your beliefs. There are examples everywhere where we have done this before up until this point. Employees have been able to take off on Sundays or religious holidays. That has been respected. Crosses and other religious symbols have been respected. Certain special activity restrictions, like kosher foods, have been honored. Not working certain days, Sabbaths, have been honored. There is even a religious conscientious objector provision, where we have honored people's religious beliefs regarding military service. Always our country has upheld the Constitution first and held that sacred that it is our religious right to live free.

You had the Pilgrims come to this country. Why? So they could have religious freedom. It is the foundation our country has been built on. And yet it is being jeopardized, trampled on, and attacked by the Affordable Care Act.

Now, tomorrow, the U.S. Supreme Court is going to hear the case of these two American families and see if they can be forced by their government to go against their religious moral objections. This is a historic moment. It is one that will have ramifications forever in our country. What do we stand for? What will we allow our government to do and inflict on our lives?

My colleagues and I are here tonight to share the concerns we have as we stand up for the people that we represent and for what our Founders started this country on and why we want to stand for future generations, to protect those freedoms that those who have gone before us stood up and fought for us, for our generation. And we hope and pray that the Supreme Court will uphold the Constitution and will not jeopardize it or trample on it.

So I thank my colleagues for coming tonight, and I would like to ask my friend from Ohio, BOB LATTA, to share his thoughts on this very important historic moment.

□ 2045

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for first hosting this

Special Order tonight, and I appreciate you recognizing me to speak here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in defense of our First Amendment rights and in support of the millions of American jobs, livelihoods, and health care plans that are now in jeopardy as a result of the ObamaCare HHS mandate.

Tomorrow, the Supreme Court will be hearing oral arguments in both the *Sebelius v. Hobby Lobby* and *Conestoga Wood Specialties v. Sebelius* cases challenging the constitutionality of the ObamaCare HHS mandate. I am hopeful that the court will recognize and acknowledge that the mandate unquestionably infringes upon Americans' rights of conscience and the freedom to live and work according to one's faith or religious beliefs.

This ObamaCare mandate wrongfully forces American citizens to choose between their conscience or face oppressive fines, as the gentlelady has already pointed out, that will undoubtedly destroy family-owned businesses across this great country. Equally alarming is that this mandate will drive employers to stop offering health insurance coverage to their employees altogether to escape the encroaching hand of government that is coercing individuals to violate their fundamental freedoms.

We have to remember this is occurring at a time when ObamaCare is cutting millions of jobs and forcing taxpayers from full-time jobs to part-time jobs. This is unacceptable and completely contrary to the tradition of our country and the principles of our democratic government.

My hope and the hope of millions of other Americans is that the Supreme Court will act to protect Americans from this government infringement and reassert the full scope and intent of the liberties conferred upon all citizens through the First Amendment.

I again thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank Representative LATTA, and you brought up a great point, of how employees can lose coverage. They have health insurance now, these two families are offering it, but an option they have is to drop coverage completely. How is that helpful to these hardworking Americans who work there?

Now I would like to turn to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I, along with 71 of my colleagues, have signed on to the brief in support of *Hobby Lobby*. We must fight for religious freedom. In responding to the *Hobby Lobby* case, the President has acknowledged how critical religious liberty is to our freedom. I couldn't agree more.

There is a reason why the Bill of Rights prioritizes our right to religious freedom: our Founders knew people

could never be free if they could not worship in a manner they found appropriate. Sadly, ObamaCare takes away that right by forcing Americans to participate in a practice they are morally opposed to. ObamaCare is more about forcing Americans to follow a certain dogma rather than promoting a healthy society.

Tomorrow, the Supreme Court will hear the advocates for religious liberty pitted against the voice in support of government moralism. From *Plessy v. Ferguson* to *Roe v. Wade* to the ObamaCare ruling, we have seen how a handful of judges can take away our natural rights. I pray the Supreme Court will rule on the side of American liberty.

The Supreme Court must protect the First Amendment. The foundation of our Nation rests upon it.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank Representative BENTIVOLIO. Well said. Foundational principle: religious liberty. I thank you very much for that.

Now I turn to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) to share her thoughts on this historic moment.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentlelady from Missouri for hosting this important discussion because nothing could be more important and more basic to every American than standing on the principle of our First Amendment rights of speech and religious expression.

You know, it was very interesting, just the week before last we had an expert on James Madison speaking to us, and he wrote a book about Madison. Madison is the author of our First Amendment, and we had the document in Madison's own handwriting where he had his First Amendment. James Madison crossed out the word "full toleration" when it came to religious liberties, and instead he inserted not just belief but also the free exercise, the acting of our beliefs. This is what America is about. We are standing here in the well of the House of Representatives, the most important forum for freedom of speech in the world, and just beyond the double doors of this Chamber lies the rotunda, and in the rotunda is a painting of the Pilgrims, and the Pilgrims are on their knees before they come to the United States. It is the "Embarkation of the Pilgrims." They have open before them a copy of the Bible, the Geneva Bible, turned to the New Testament. And why was it that the Pilgrims came to the United States? They searched for religious freedom and toleration.

One thing that the bill that will be before the Supreme Court tomorrow addresses is this issue: will toleration be a two-way street? I think it is. Toleration should not be just the government-enforced coercion of government's beliefs on every American, because that is what is happening in a family business, for the Green family with *Hobby Lobby* or the Hahn family with *Conestoga*. This is the government enforcing its beliefs down the

throats of two family-owned businesses, and what is at stake is not just the rights of the people who own the business. What about the rights of those who work in the business, the employees? They also have moral rights and protections. These businesses pay very good wages and they offer very good benefits to their employees. So here is what we are being looking at: either the business pays over \$36,000 a year per employee for the price of standing up for their moral beliefs, or they have to give up health insurance altogether for their employees and pay the government a \$2,000 fine per employee. Who, I ask you, benefits? That is dealing with a case that is coming before the court tomorrow.

An even more fundamental issue is at stake, and it is this: here we are, Representatives of the United States Congress, and we are having to fight President Obama on whether or not we can retain our constitutional rights and liberties. That is what is at stake.

We are standing here for the Constitution. We are standing here for every man and every woman in the United States that agrees with those rights. This is a discussion worth having. I thank the Speaker. I thank the gentlelady from Missouri. Tomorrow is an extremely important day, and I thank God for all of the wonderful Members of Congress who are standing up for these important issues. They are not negotiable. They are not for sale at any price.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank Representative BACHMANN. Very well said. I thank God for Members here as well who are standing up for religious freedoms. I thought she said it so well: Is toleration going to be a two-way street, or are we going to allow this government to impose its will, its morals on the rest of us? Thank you for sharing.

Now I turn to my fellow friend from Missouri, Representative ANN WAGNER, and look forward to hearing what she has to say.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for hosting this Special Order. There is no greater defender or champion for faith or family or freedom than Congresswoman VICKY HARTZLER.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to protect the conscience of the American people. Since taking office in January of last year, I have heard from countless constituents on how the government is abusing their individual freedoms under ObamaCare over and over again.

I recently heard from my constituent, George, a seminarian from St. Louis County, about the administration's mandate. He notes that what the administration is asking Catholic hospitals and nonprofits to do is in direct opposition to our Catholic beliefs. He writes to me:

Mrs. WAGNER, I ask you to please stand up for us. We are being persecuted and unjustly forced to comply with procedures that are in conflict with our own beliefs.

As George articulated, the United States Federal Government is currently discriminating against its citizens of faith in this country.

One of this country's founding principles is the freedom to worship without interference by the Federal Government. Our forefathers did not flee from oppressive nations, build a country on liberties, and emblaze them in the Bill of Rights just for this administration to trample on them over and over again.

Yet the rule issued by the administration under ObamaCare does just that. This administration now mandates that religious nonprofits and businesses must provide health care benefits that go against their fundamental beliefs. If businesses and nonprofits do not comply with this mandate, they are penalized with crippling fines that the gentlewoman from Missouri has talked about. These fines can go up to \$100 per day per employee. This means that if a business decides to provide health care but does not comply with the mandate, they can owe up to \$36,500 for one employee for the year. This is in comparison to the \$2,000 they could owe for not providing any health insurance—any health insurance—for that same employee at all.

Mr. Speaker, not only does this not make any sense, it is discrimination by the Federal Government and it is wrong. This mandate puts the jobs, the livelihoods, and the health care of millions of Americans at risk. It forces those who stand up for their conscience to choose between paying detrimental fines that could shut down their business or dropping health care coverage, as has been discussed before, completely for their employees altogether.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you: Should the Federal Government be allowed to tell the St. Louis Post-Dispatch what they can and cannot print? Should the Federal Government tell my neighbors in Ballwin, Missouri, what they can and cannot say about their government leaders? Should the Federal Government tell George, the seminarian from St. Louis County, what he can and cannot preach?

Mr. Speaker, while in many parts of the world authoritarian governments control the press, prohibit freedom of speech, and only allow for certain beliefs, that cannot be the case in the United States of America. We will not, I believe, stand by and watch this administration strip away our freedoms. I will continue to fight on behalf of the constituents of Missouri and all the American people to keep this the land of the free.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, ANN. That was great. It really goes back to people like George. The individuals are having their liberties violated, and it is wrong. It is just chilling what he said: Are we going to allow this government to discriminate against citizens of faith? We don't want that to happen. Thank you for your comments.

Now we turn to someone who knows personally one of these families who started their business in a garage, followed the American Dream, succeeded, provided jobs, and now that is in jeopardy. I turn to Representative JAMES LANKFORD from Oklahoma to give us your insights in this moment of history.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentlelady for hosting this conversation and for standing up for liberty. I have seen you on this floor over and over again, speaking up for what is right in our Nation. I very much appreciate that.

When a family runs their business by the principles of their faith, which those principles used to be protected in America, can a President step in and say: I disagree with your faith, and so I will pass a regulation.

This is very important because some people believe this is written into the law. It is not. This is a regulation that was selected by this President. Can a President step in and say, I am going to create a new regulation that you can no longer practice your faith at work? You can practice your faith at home, but you can't practice your faith at work.

Hobby Lobby is a family-owned business. It doesn't want Washington to be its boss. They believe that abortion takes the life of a child and that every child deserves the chance at life. What is wrong with that?

If a Federal employee disagrees with the faith practice of someone in a company, does that business have to change their faith, change it to the faith of the Federal employee, or can they keep their own faith?

□ 2100

It is now the rule that to open a company or to work in a job or to get health care, you have to have the same religious convictions as the President of the United States.

If you don't, you will be fined until you change your faith practice. That is not what we are founded on; that is not who we are—every faith, every opportunity for every person to live out what they believe at home, at work, and in the community.

Just days ago, the President spoke at the National Prayer Breakfast about the cornerstone right of the free expression of religion. That includes Americans who believe that children are a gift of God and they should be nurtured and cared for, not discarded as tissue.

Washington is not the boss of every American. Our Constitution matters, freedom of religion matters, and, quite frankly, children matter.

This family is not some corporate ogre trying to rule over their employees. They are my neighbor. They live a mile from my house. They are a quiet family. They are a great family that has lived out their faith. They are a tremendous community partner in so many ways in our community and around the country and, quite frankly,

around the globe with what they have done to take care of the poor and the needy and the people of faith all over the world.

They are an incredible gift to our Nation, yet they are being told: you cannot practice your faith anymore.

This is not something new that they are doing. The government changed the rules on them. They didn't change their practice. Suddenly, a new administration walked in and changed the rules and said: you can no longer live your faith at work.

Well, I am honored that they have stepped up and they have said not so, not so for their business, not so for businesses around the country. All of us have seen the lists and lists and lists of waivers that this administration has given for the Affordable Care Act, waivers for the employer mandate, waivers for the income and verification requirements, waivers for the Small Business Health Options Program, a waiver just given a month ago.

The administration delayed the requirement for businesses with fewer than 100 employees to offer health insurance until 2016; and then this one, just March the 5th, a few days ago, the administration announced it will allow people to keep noncompliant insurance plans through 2016—that is, noncompliant except in this area.

In this one area, they have said: no, we are not going to give a waiver for that one; instead, we will fine you \$36,500. Everyone else that is noncompliant, we will give you a waiver, except for Hobby Lobby and other businesses like them. They get no waiver. They get the hammer.

Is that fair? Is that right? Is this what we have really become as a Nation? I think better of us.

I look forward to the Supreme Court taking up this case and setting things straight because, in this country, we have a constitutional right to speak out and to live out our faith.

With that, I yield back to the gentlelady.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, Representative LANKFORD. I am so glad you shared about this family. You know them. What a treasure they really are to our Nation and the world, as you said, and truly courageous, standing up, putting their business on the line, saying this is worth fighting for. Those who have gone before us have fought for us. Now, it is time for us to stand up and fight. Thank you for sharing that.

You are right. They are trying to change the regulations. You can't practice your faith at work, being coerced to change your faith practice, gave waivers to others, but they give the Green family the hammer. Well said. Thank you.

Now, I turn to someone who knows the other family involved in the Supreme Court decision, who has the honor of representing the Hahn family. That is my friend and courageous leader for faith, family, freedom, for years, Representative JOE PITTS.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank the gentlelady for hosting this Special Order. This is so important because, tomorrow, the U.S. Supreme Court will hear arguments in the case of Hobby Lobby and Conestoga Wood Specialties against Sebelius. I have the privilege, tomorrow, to sit in the Chamber and listen to the oral arguments.

At the heart of the argument is the question about whether you stop following your conscience when you go into business. For family businesses like Conestoga Wood Specialties, located in my Congressional district, faith and business are not separate.

Their business would not be the same if they did not apply the values that guide their life. I visited this business. I have talked to their employees. I know the Hahn family. They are sincere Mennonites and wonderful people of faith and good business people.

It is those values that prompted Conestoga Wood to provide quality health insurance to their employees in the first place. They provided health insurance long before this regulation or mandate came along under ObamaCare.

No government mandate had to tell them that it was the right thing to do. Now, the government wants to use force and fines to stipulate the details of what that plan covers. Conestoga Wood and many other businessowners of faith now find themselves in a catch-22 of conscience.

The First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act were meant to guard against using the heavy hand of government to infringe on our religious rights. We should not have to leave our faith at the church door.

Under the First Amendment, we are guaranteed freedom of religion, and I might remind you, it is the First Amendment. It is not the Second Amendment. It is not the Sixth or the 16th or the 26th. It is the First Amendment. It is the first thing mentioned in the First Amendment—freedom of religion, not freedom from religion.

Pennsylvania has a long history of people of differing faiths engaging in commerce. 100 years before there was a First Amendment, William Penn established his colony as a place where religious dissenters could find freedom and safety.

The Forefathers of the Hahn family—Mennonites and others—came to Pennsylvania because it was advertised as a place where you could live and work freely according to your religious beliefs.

These people of faith supported themselves with businesses, and the colonial authorities in Pennsylvania let them apply their principles freely. These principles of religious freedom would later inform the founding of our Republic, and something that had at first been uniquely Pennsylvanian would become part of our national culture.

Family-owned and -operated businesses provide millions of good jobs in

America. The Hahn family is facing a difficult choice that no American should have to face.

We hope and pray that the Supreme Court will uphold a basic Pennsylvania value and a basic American value and the First Amendment right to religious freedom.

Every American, including family businessowners, should be free to live and work according to their beliefs without the fear of punishment or coercion by the government.

Americans don't give up their freedom when they open a family business. Let's hope and pray that the Supreme Court will uphold all of our rights to religious freedom here in this great country we call America.

I yield back.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, gentlemen. So true. Family-owned businesses have a right to not be coerced into giving up their faith just for providing jobs.

Now, I would like to turn to my friend and truly a leader here for families and life and common sense, Representative CHRIS SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend and colleague from Missouri for her outstanding leadership on behalf of the life issues, for her courage, and for her consistent approach to these vital issues that really are also passing. She has been a leader for so long. Thank you for organizing this, this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I, like my colleagues, am grateful that the U.S. Supreme Court took up this critical case for religious liberty; and I—we, Mr. Speaker, are hopeful that the court will provide much-needed relief from this discriminatory ObamaCare policy.

Under the Obama administration's coercive mandate, family-owned businesses like Hobby Lobby and Conestoga Wood have found themselves in the impossible situation of being forced to violate their moral or religious beliefs or face crippling fines. This not only puts businesses in serious and unnecessary risk, but also employees who may lose their jobs, as well as their health care.

It is the height of hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, for the Obama administration to coerce family businesses that provide generous health care for their employees into a situation that may force them to close and to shutter their businesses.

The ObamaCare financial penalties are draconian, egregious, and without precedent in U.S. law. Under ObamaCare, family businesses that do provide health care for employees, like the Hobby Lobby, but object to covering certain drugs and devices—in their case, that provide for abortions—will be fined up to \$36,500 per year, per employee. That is outrageous.

For the Green family of Hobby Lobby, this could mean an amount to nearly half a billion dollars in fines every year. There is no way they can absorb that kind of body blow without closing their doors.

I would note, parenthetically, that a company that does not provide any health care insurance—the gentlelady from Missouri spoke about this in her opening comments—will be fined some \$2,000 per year, clearly, an unfair burden, but far less than the \$36,500 per year, per employee, if they refuse, again, to include certain drugs or devices that violate their moral or religious tenets.

When you calculate that out for the Green family of Hobby Lobby, dumping their existing health care coverage for employees could result in fines up to \$26 million per year; again, a huge penalty, but that is still \$448 million less than if they actually provided health insurance and remained true to their core convictions, which they will do.

Mr. Speaker, this burdensome penalty is completely unfair, unreasonable. It is unworkable, and it is unconscionable. The Obama administration is saying: we will punish you, we will hurt you, we will even put you out of business for providing health care to your employees, unless you provide health care according to the government's conscience.

Also, employees currently on their business health plan could lose their coverage that they desperately need for their families, as well as for themselves. Secretary Sebelius and President Obama have no business whatsoever imposing their morality on people of faith, but that is exactly what their oppressive mandate does.

The Supreme Court, Mr. Speaker, has a duty to protect the religious and conscience rights of the Greens and the Hahns and everyone else suffering government-imposed harm. The U.S. high court must act to protect the First Amendment rights of these families. Protecting these rights also protects their employees.

Let's make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. This mandate and its deleterious effects and consequences are very much Obama's willful intention. The imposition of this attack on religious freedom is no accident. It comes straight from the pages of ObamaCare.

In December of 2009, in the runup to the passage of that legislation, Senator MIKULSKI offered an amendment which provided the authorizing language for this oppressive mandate.

In 2009, the same year, when President Obama spoke at Notre Dame University, which parenthetically is also suing over the mandate, he spoke about drafting a sensible conscience clause—his words—and yet, today, protection of conscience is another highly visible broken promise of ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, to tell people that their conscience is irrelevant and that they must follow the Federal Government's conscience, rather than their own, is completely antithetical to the American principle of religious freedom and the First Amendment.

Unless reversed, Obama's attack on conscience rights will result in government-imposed discrimination against

those who seek according to their faith and their moral code.

Under the weight of the mandate's ruinous fines and penalties, many businesses could be forced to shut down, eliminating jobs. I would never have believed that this kind of religious violation could occur in the United States of America, but it has. The Supreme Court must end this abuse.

I yield back to my good friend.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Absolutely. This is a moment in history, a moment of opportunity, for this Supreme Court to stand up and to do the right thing. Half a billion dollars in fines, half a billion dollars in fines this company is facing. Thank you for bringing home what that means.

□ 2115

You know they are going to coerce. You said that it is draconian, that it is unprecedented, that they are going to force you. That is the definition of a bully. "We are going to bully you into doing what we think is right." We stand up against that in every other arena, and we are standing up against it here as well.

Now I would like to turn to my friend from Nebraska, Representative JEFF FORTENBERRY, to share his thoughts at this moment in history.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. First, let me thank the gentlelady from Missouri for her leadership, not only tonight, but on this absolutely most critical issue.

Mr. Speaker, there is an important court case tomorrow, one that has come upon our country fairly quietly. I am not sure most Americans actually know what is at issue here. What is at issue is whether or not the relationship between the government and her people will fundamentally shift, whether the government will be able to coerce people who disagree as to the content of what their health care should be based upon their religious faiths or their deeply held ethical sensibilities. If they don't obey, they will be fined, as was mentioned here earlier.

In a very ironic way, the case before the Supreme Court tomorrow is about whether or not Hobby Lobby, a store at which millions of Americans, I assume, enjoy shopping—at which I enjoy shopping—that very outwardly celebrates, projects, its Christian perspective in the way it conducts its business. I assume, because of that perspective—the desire to do the right thing by their employees—they have established a good health care plan. If they drop their health care plan, they will be fined \$2,000 by the government. That is all they will have to pay. Yet, if they refuse to go along with that which violates their religious perspective and fundamental ethical sensibilities, the government will fine them \$36,000.

Again, the irony here is striking in that a business that is doing the right thing, which is based upon the values of their owners, which promotes good products that millions of Americans enjoy, which closes on Sunday because

that is their stated Christian belief and because that is the way they choose to exercise it—I don't see any lawsuits over that—nonetheless is saying, in their health care plan, they simply cannot provide certain drugs that would violate the dictate of their faith, certain drugs that this administration has deemed "preventative."

Another irony here is, when most of us were looking at the health care bill when it was first passed, there was a portion that was put in there called "prevention services." Now, I did not vote for the health care bill. I believe we need the right type of health care in our country, one that actually reduces costs and improves health care outcomes and protects vulnerable people; but what we have instead is a huge shift of cost to unsustainable government spending and a serious erosion of health care liberties. We can do better than this. We must do better than this.

Buried in that health care bill was prevention authority. To me, that means that we are going to try to prevent the onset of diabetes or the onset of heart disease—chronic disease—which is part of what is driving up our health care costs and which is that we could maybe get underneath if we were all thinking about and adhering to the principles and dynamics of wellness. That is what I thought it was about. Instead, it is an ideology of the administration's that is imposing upon people of faith or other Americans who simply do not have a faith perspective on this but who know that religious freedom is a first freedom and the government should not coerce people from their deeply held, reasonably held belief systems or those who have ethical sensibilities to certain types of drugs and procedures. That is what is at issue here, and if it goes the wrong way, the relationship between the government and her people will ultimately change.

You see, the government will then be conferring this right of religious liberty, not protecting it. It will be deciding who gets to exercise what type of religious liberty rather than protecting the individual conscience of the person—that sacred space that is inherent to the dignity of all persons—which is where our rights actually come from. In the First Amendment of the Constitution, this is clearly stated, and it is reflected in the ideals of religious liberty and in the separation of church and State. I have a copy of the original Bill of Rights—not the "original" original but a copy of the original—in my office, and actually penciled in there, as they were working through the draft, is "the rights of conscience." That concept actually precedes the principle of religious freedom because it says, again, rights are not conferred by the government. They come from the inherent dignity of each person by virtue of who he is and the way in which he has been created; and that person's ability to exercise who he is in the most poignant way, particularly in his religious faith, is a sacred space



that the government must protect. That is why they listed it as the number one spot in the Bill of Rights, but that is what tomorrow is about.

In the aftermath of the French Revolution, there was a young child born named Jeanne Jugan. She was one of eight children, and they lived in the west coast of France, and her father was a fisherman. One day, he was lost at sea, and the family was reduced to poverty. As a teenager, Jeanne Jugan went out and worked as a maid servant, doing servile labor, to help the family and to help sustain herself. She received a proposal of marriage, but in her own discernment decided that was not appropriate for her, and she, apparently, lived a quiet and humble life.

One day, outside in the cold, she saw a woman who was blind and paralyzed and freezing, and she picked her up and brought her to her own bed. This was a key turning point in Jeanne Jugan's life. Perhaps she always knew her life would turn out this way. There was a religious order called the Little Sisters of the Poor, which traced its origins back to that simple act of kindness, to Jeanne Jugan. She was canonized a saint by Pope John Paul after a medical doctor from the Omaha area of Nebraska received a miraculous cure after having asked for her intercession. She was recently canonized a saint. The Little Sisters of the Poor are not nuns on a bus, and they are not political activists. They just take care of the vulnerable elderly through health care facilities. Yet they find themselves having to sue the Federal Government to be able to exercise their religious freedom as they see fit.

That is what this health care bill has brought about through this prevention mandate. It is a direct frontal assault on America's first freedom, so much so that a group of humble nuns—and as I spoke to one, she told me: In the elderly, we just see Christ—that has dedicated its life to the poor and vulnerable in health care is now having to fight in the court system for its right to exercise its religious faith as it sees fit.

So tomorrow's decision, while it is about two very strong businesses—Hobby Lobby and Conestoga Wood—has very vast ramifications. Even the people who are in religious orders who have set up charitable institutions are being forced by the government to, again, buy products through their health care plans for their employees, products that are inconsistent with their faith traditions. As one of the nuns told me: It violates our conscience. We didn't want to sue the government, but yet here we are.

I am glad to have had a little bit of opportunity with you tonight, my good friend VICKY HARTZLER, to discuss this most essential of issues because, if we don't speak, who is going to speak? I am not quite sure that all of America has really realized what is at stake at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning—whether the government will be allowed to coerce Americans into violating that fun-

damental first freedom of religious faith and the rights of conscience. If so, it will be tremendously unfair. It is un-American. It will change the nature of the relationship between government and her people. Let's hope that the Supreme Court gets this right. There have been a few precedents before this in which they have gotten it right. In fact, the Little Sisters of the Poor has gotten an injunction so that this is not being forced upon it at the moment.

The deeper principle here that is at stake is whether or not the First Amendment to the Constitution, which guarantees the right to religious freedom—an appropriate separation between church and State—is going to hold and remain that most cherished freedom in our country to come.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, gentleman.

A fundamental shift this would represent, you said. The relationship between the government and her citizens will forever change. That is chilling.

I appreciate your sharing the story of the Little Sisters of the Poor to show that this isn't just about the two entities that are before the Supreme Court tomorrow. In fact, there are 94 different lawsuits around the country from other small businesses and entities and colleges and others that, too, are being forced into this. So this has huge implications, not just for the 94 that have bravely, courageously stood up and said "no" and challenged it, but for each and every citizen.

With that, I would like to thank my friend, Representative DAN LIPINSKI from Illinois, for coming here today. I appreciate his leadership of the Pro-Life Caucus and of other pro-family liberty issues.

So thank you for coming. What would you like to share tonight?

Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank Mrs. HARTZLER for yielding and for her leadership on this critical issue, which is not just as partisan issue. I am a Democrat. I know this is not a partisan issue—religious liberty.

This is not even just a foundational American principle. It is a fundamental human right. Many of the men and women who came to America were fleeing religious persecution and were searching for a place where they could freely exercise their faiths. They had the courage to pledge their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor to the cause. As a number of my colleagues have stated, the First Amendment to our Constitution starts with these words: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." I used to teach my American Government students that, clearly, this was not freedom to worship—just the freedom to go on Sunday or Saturday or whatever day of the week that you worshiped—but a freedom to exercise religion in the way they see proper.

As First Lady Michelle Obama stated at a conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, our faith jour-

ney isn't just about showing up on Sunday; it is about what we do Monday through Saturday as well.

That is what Americans believe, and we must protect the freedom to exercise our religious beliefs every day of the week. Many millions have had the courage to fight, and many have died to protect our Nation in this constitutional right. We all have a duty to our fellow Americans and to the world to reclaim a true religious liberty in our Nation because this goes beyond our borders. America has been a beacon of liberty for people around the world for more than two centuries. As people blessed with liberty, we have a special obligation to protect it and to proclaim it for all the world to see. Especially today, as we see around the world attacks on religious freedom, we must stand up here in America.

I want to thank all of my colleagues for standing up here today and for continuing to work in Congress to protect our religious freedom, and I want to pray for wisdom for our Supreme Court Justices tomorrow as they consider this very critical, fundamental case. We all must rededicate ourselves and continue to fight for religious freedom in our Nation, without which freedom we would be giving up on a fundamental principle that underlies this greatest of nations.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, Representative LIPINSKI.

It is so true that we are and have been the beacon of liberty for this world, and this Court decision tomorrow has implications for not only our country and its citizens but for those around the world. I, too, was a teacher, and I appreciate that, how we taught our students what the basic rights were, but this decision will impact their futures, too. If government can force its citizens to go against their basic, most fundamental, moral values and consciences, what else can it do?

With that, Representative ANDY HARRIS of Maryland, thank you for being here tonight. The floor is yours.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to thank the gentlelady from Missouri for hosting this Special Order hour this evening.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois talked about people who come to this country in fleeing religious persecution. As the gentlelady may be aware, my mother emigrated from Ukraine. She was, in fact, a Ukrainian Greek Catholic. As the gentlelady probably knows of the history, when the Soviet Union took over Ukraine, they persecuted the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, burning them to the ground. It is ironic that we are discussing this here—and that the Supreme Court will be taking up this issue—as we are seeing what is going on with religious persecution in Ukraine this week and last week, where the church in Dora, for instance—the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church—burned to the ground because, you see, the Russian Government didn't agree with the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church's beliefs.

□ 2130

So what do they do? They burn churches to the ground.

It is interesting. We have to learn the lesson, though, because they tried that. After World War II, the Soviet Union tried to destroy churches that way, but they learned the lesson that the church is not the building. The church is the group of believers who share common, deeply held religious beliefs. That is why when the Soviet Union fell, the churches that they thought they had burned to the ground rose up.

I would suggest that what is going on in Oklahoma City with Hobby Lobby and in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, with Conestoga Wood Products is a church burning without a match. In fact, it is even more insidious because you can't see something. You can't see the ashes. But in fact, if the government has its way with these two employers, they will attempt to persecute them for their religious beliefs and attempt to destroy them. That is not the way it is in America.

As the gentleman from Illinois said, there are plenty of places in the world where that may be true, but we do have a First Amendment. We have a First Amendment that doesn't protect church buildings, it protects religious believers in whatever walk of life they are in, whatever they are doing, from the government imposing their belief system, whether it is the case of a belief of a religious body or a belief that you shouldn't provide life-destroying drugs. Because that is what is at issue in these cases.

And I would hope that the Supreme Court realizes that this country does have a First Amendment and that its job, its duty, our duty is to protect the religious beliefs of every individual, including those owners of Conestoga Wood Products and Hobby Lobby, who deserve the right and freedom in America to believe their religious beliefs and not have the government impose theirs.

So I thank the gentlelady from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Well said. Thank you for sharing your story.

I now have a friend from Kansas, Representative TIM HUELSKAMP.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Thank you, Congresswoman. It is a pleasure and honor to join you tonight. I will keep my comments short.

You have heard the words here tonight. You have heard the words "religion tax." You have heard the words "religious litmus test." You certainly heard the words "religious liberty." Of course, we also heard that the principles of the First Amendment have to do with religious liberty and religious freedom.

I was on the floor the day after the Supreme Court decision on the President's health care law, and I would like to issue a challenge to what is generally considered the swing vote of this current court, the Chief Justice himself.

When I spoke about this issue, court challenges were already coming forward on this HHS mandate, but knowing that the Chief Justice is a Roman Catholic, I issue a strong challenge to the Chief Justice.

Given the history of the Catholic Church in this country, it has been one of severe discrimination at times. I would ask the Chief Justice—the deciding vote—to consider his core convictions. I believe he bears a particular burden to protect the religious liberties of employers and their employees from the excesses of his very own constitutional creation.

The court asked to be in the middle of this position. They asked for the government to have the right to tell businesses what to do, whether for profit or nonprofit or businesses or non-businesses as well.

What is at stake here is not the choice of businesses alone. What is at stake here is not necessarily what the government can tell selected entities. At stake is our Constitution and our rights and freedoms as Americans.

We were founded on the issue of religious freedom and liberty from our very beginning. Tomorrow, I stand with the businesses, the non-businesses, and the private entities as well.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, gentleman. Well said.

We have been here, and we are not done yet. My time is about done, but we are going to continue on here because we believe in standing up for the Constitution. We believe in the First Amendment: religious liberty. We believe in our country and our future and our children's future. We want to preserve those freedoms that others have sacrificed for.

So I want to thank all my colleagues who have come here tonight and have shared their wisdom and their insights into this. Let us pray tomorrow that the Supreme Court hears the words that we have spoken and rules on the side of freedom.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for the remainder of the time until 10 p.m.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I also want to thank the gentlelady from Missouri for organizing the previous hour's discussion on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the people of faith at companies like Hobby Lobby and Pennsylvania's Conestoga Wood. These companies want to provide health insurance for their workers, and they should be able to do

that without violating their deeply held religious and moral convictions.

It is simply unacceptable that President Obama's health care law requires people of faith to violate their conscience rights. This happens when regulations issued pursuant to the law forces them to pay for services such as abortifacient drugs when they provide health insurance for their employees.

The hostility in the President's health care law towards people of faith is made clear when you consider the penalty scheme in the law. If these family-owned businesses do not comply with the mandate, they could be fined \$100 per day per employee. That amounts to \$36,500 per year per employee, even if the health insurance provided is of excellent quality.

Compare that with the \$2,000 fine per year per employee if they stopped offering insurance altogether.

How is that fair, just, or respectful of their beliefs?

This poster, Mr. Speaker, is striking. This discrepancy is simply indefensible. Looking at these numbers, you would think that this administration thinks that it is more important for an employer to provide abortifacient drug coverage than it is to provide comprehensive health insurance coverage that would cover items such as cancer treatment.

As the Supreme Court considers this case tomorrow and hears oral arguments, I join men and women of faith from western Pennsylvania and across the country in defending conscience rights and religious liberty, and standing with Hobby Lobby and Conestoga Wood.

I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania very much. They are very, very good points.

Also along the lines my friend was talking about, some of us were here when our fine President stood at that podium and spoke to all of us here and he said in his speech that in his bill there would be no funding of abortion. We all heard that. In fact, there was such an involuntary response of JOE WILSON to categorize that statement. From the bill, we had seen from the Democrats it was clear there was going to be money forced out of taxpayers' hands and forced to fund abortion, and we now know that is true.

Most of the time, the decent thing to do, if you find out that something you said was simply not true, the decent thing to do is to step up and say, You know what? JOE WILSON, you were right, but it was unintentional. I didn't mean to misrepresent anything. So I want to set this straight.

Instead, it is like this administration has doubled down and said not only is the government funding it, but you are going to have to fund abortion for your employees, and it doesn't matter that you have firmly held religious convictions against it.

I just wanted to mention to my colleagues that before I came to the floor

to hear the wonderful work that our friend Mrs. HARTZLER has been doing—is she from the “Show Me” State or what—I walked by where Roger Williams’ statue has always been since I have been here. Apparently, they have moved statues, because he is not there. It has been in the last week I know they have moved Roger Williams.

Roger Williams was born in England between 1603 and 1606. He grew up a member of a privileged class. He received a liberal arts education from Sir Edward Coke.

This is from the Capitol Web site.

He abandoned the study of law to become a priest in the Church of England. He was interested in the Puritan movement and the newly established Massachusetts Bay Colony. He was warmly welcomed to the New World by Massachusetts Governor John Winthrop. He arrived in Boston.

Williams was an adamant separatist. He accepted a post as an assistant pastor in Salem, reputedly a friendly place. However, his teachings were deemed radical, and he was banished from Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1635. He founded the colony of Rhode Island in 1636.

I know each State gets to choose which two statues you want to have. I look forward to him coming back. I am sure that they would never have permanently removed the statue of the founder of Rhode Island. There is nobody I can think of more appropriate.

I just thought it probably is appropriate that a man that staked his entire life on religious freedom would not have his statue here to figuratively witness what has gone on and what has passed in this Capitol.

To talk about this issue further, I want to yield to my friend from Georgia, DOUG COLLINS.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding. I also thank the gentlewoman from Missouri, who started our night off. I think there has been a lot said as we go forward in bringing this important matter.

I want to take just a little bit of a different tack as we talk about the issues of tonight.

I believe we are blessed to live in a time when medical research and technology have allowed us to extend and improve human life in ways we never thought possible, and the truth of this matter is that why we are standing here tonight is about life. It is about an understanding of life, and it is about the life not only of the unborn, but also those born, and the right to express the life that is given to them.

From the moment of conception, each individual has unique DNA that dictates his or her gender, eye color, blood type, and countless other specifications. Even from his or her earliest moments, a child in the womb has the ability to respond to his or her environment, as well as adapt to that environment.

These scientific facts are amazing, but I have an even deeper motivation

for protecting human life because I believe life is a gift from God. I believe that that gift from God is also expressed and was expressed by the Founders when they said that they would stand up for the right to express our religious liberties. As ROGER WILLIAMS was just spoken of, that right to say: This is what I believe, and this is why I am in this country.

And that is what we are talking about here. It is not only life at birth and in the womb, but it is life expressed outside of that and the God-given, I believe, rights that are expressed in our Constitution.

So for me, I not only understand that life begins at conception, but life continues all through until natural death. That natural life here in America is expressed in ways that we can contribute our life to others. How we express it should not be taken away.

Unfortunately, this administration is too preoccupied with its own ideological commitment to its definition of good health insurance to care about other points of view. That is why it continues spending so much time and energy and, by the way, taxpayer resources trying to silence those who do not share its view of the contraceptive mandate.

Just a few months ago, I stood on the floor of this House and thought I would never have come to the House of Representatives and ever determined that it would have been non-essential to have religious liberty protected on the floor of this House or in this country.

□ 2145

That is just an amazing thought to me, that we would even have to think about that; but under the President’s nonsensical policies that was just expressed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, businessowners would face fines of \$36,500 for each employer every year they were offered health insurance consistent with their religious convictions.

On the other hand, they could just quit offering health care altogether and only pay \$2,000.

Tell me what the priorities of this administration are, and I will show you the money. I have always said: you want to see the priorities of somebody in life, look at their checkbook, and look at their calendar.

This administration’s priorities are found in their checkbook, and they are found in their calendar because that is what they want to punish us for, and they have got a timeline to do it, and they said now is the time.

That is the argument to be made by the Supreme Court tomorrow, the argument you want to step forward with Hobby Lobby and others, that when they step forth before those Justices tomorrow, they say here is the priority of this country.

The priority of this country should be that it protects religious liberties, it protects what is found in the Constitution, it protects those liberties upon

which we were founded and not an ideological agenda driven by points it made by hurting others.

I agree with my friend from Texas. I was always taught that, when you make a mistake, just say: look, I made a mistake.

But that is not what this administration wants to do. They want to continue to beat an ideological driven policy. They want to continue to beat down and say: this is what we believe, and you will believe like us because we are not so sure that the essentials of the Constitution are essential anymore.

It is time that I hope tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, that the argument made before the highest court in the land is that there is a right to protect life, that there is a right, even better, to have religious liberty protected; and that, when I get up and I go in or I have my business, that those rights aren’t checked at the door, and that, when you look at priorities of this country—when, God forbid, they look back a number of years from now and they say: I hope they stood up for the rights that the Constitutional Founders founded.

And when they do that, then they will see our priorities. They will see the ones on this floor tonight, and they will say what is priority is what we spend on and what we plan on.

For this administration, it is obvious that theirs is an ideological driven agenda that says the Constitution only when it is convenient, and I will only pay for it, but I will punish you if you don’t.

Mr. Speaker, that is wrong. It is time to change it.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Georgia so very much. I need to come to where he preaches some time and get some more of that good preaching. That was outstanding; and I know, as a servant to the country in Congress and our military, as he is, as well as a servant of Christ, what a powerful message.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, you may not be aware—I wasn’t until today—in past times, when there was oral arguments in which Members of Congress were interested, we could call over to the Clerk of the Supreme Court, and they normally just make one bench—sometimes more—but at least one pew there available for Members of Congress, either as the Speaker would allocate or first come.

But anyway, the Marshal of the Supreme Court, Pamela Talkin, has decided that, though it has always been reciprocity in the past, we invite the Supreme Court to come and watch speeches they may care to, reciprocity between the House and Senate, the Marshal, Pamela Talkin, perhaps she got guidance from one of the Justices or the Chief Justice, but Members of Congress are not going to have a reserved spot, which is interesting. We are supposed to oversee that Court, just as they oversee the Congress.

So as of today, I am going to be the most outspoken supporter of getting cameras in the Supreme Court. I think it is time. If they are going to do something untoward, we need to have people be able to see it.

As Members of Congress, if we are funding them, we need to be able to see what they are doing in there with our own eyes, so we need to get cameras in there, and we can thank Pamela Talkin for that.

At this time, I yield to my dear friend from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) and also the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for putting this time together tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Hobby Lobby Stores and Conestoga Wood Specialties as they take a stand for religious freedom against the unconstitutional coercive ObamaCare HHS mandate.

All Americans, including family businessowners, should have the freedom to live and work according to their religious values without fear of the government punishing them for doing so.

This issue of religious liberty is not limited to these two employers. Many family-owned small businesses and nonprofits across this country have expressed grave concern about this mandate from the Obama administration. It forces them to violate their deeply-held religious beliefs or face crippling penalties.

In my home State of Colorado, Hercules Industries, founded in 1962 by William Newland, a family-owned heating, ventilation, and cooling manufacturer with locations all over Colorado, including Colorado Springs, has been forced into this legal dilemma as well.

As devout Catholics, the Newland family has always worked to run their companies in a way that reflects their sincerely-held religious convictions. This is why, when the Obama administration issued this mandate to force them to violate those beliefs and provide coverage of potentially life-terminating drugs and devices, they had to file a lawsuit to protect their religious freedoms.

Hercules Industries already provides generous health insurance for their employees through a self-insured group plan. With 265 full-time employees throughout its various locations, Hercules could be facing over \$9 million in government fines each year.

This comes if they refuse to violate their deeply-held religious convictions and if they don't comply with the Obama mandate to provide drugs to their employees that the Newland family believes can end human life.

What an unbearable choice the Obama administration has burdened them with. Not only is the HHS mandate an attack on religious liberty, it also puts into jeopardy jobs and health care of millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I support businesses like Hercules Industries, Hobby Lobby.

And Conestoga Wood Specialties because of their principled stand against this oppressive mandate. Religious freedom is a foundational component of American greatness. It is of utmost importance that we do everything we can to defend it.

I look forward to the Supreme Court's decision, and I hope and I pray that this will be a positive precedent for future religious freedom cases.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Colorado so very much. We have done much together in our time here, and I am grateful for his service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend from Florida (Mr. YOHO), for such time as he may use.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the gentleman from Texas, along with the gentlewoman from Missouri, for starting this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today—or tonight—not only in firm opposition to the Affordable Care Act, but also to the Affordable Care Act's religious mandate.

I would like to take you back to March of 2009, when a one-sided government passed a bill, and they said that we have to pass it to see what is in it, we have to pass it to see how it is going to work. I think what we are seeing today is evidence of that, and we are just seeing the tip of the iceberg.

In accordance to this terrible law, HHS issued rules that health care plans must include all FDA-approved contraceptives, including drugs that can terminate a human embryo and sterilization services.

The HHS mandate only contains an exemption for churches, but not for religious nonprofits or businesses run by people of faith who are morally opposed to such practices.

The HHS mandate puts jobs and the health care of millions of Americans at risk. It forces people who stand up for their conscience to choose between paying crippling fines and dropping health care coverage altogether for their employees, as you have seen expressed over and over again tonight; yet it excludes some people of certain faiths, the Muslim faith or the Amish faith, because participating in group health insurance is a form of gambling and that is against their religious beliefs, but yet it won't exclude people who are morally opposed against this.

The First Amendment was put in place for a reason, to protect religious beliefs from being attacked by the Federal Government. The ACA, or ObamaCare, completely disregards this and attacks the freedom of America's conscience.

We are a nation of free individuals who should not have to forsake our religious beliefs and rights of conscience in order to adhere to legislation that was quickly passed into law before all the disastrous effects could be considered.

We, as Americans, must take this opportunity to stand up to the Federal Government and to protect our First

Amendment. I would like to caution all of my colleagues and the American people that the more we allow the Federal Government to do for us, the less freedoms we, as Americans, enjoy.

For me, I will stand with the First Amendment, the Constitution, and with the American people and stand for freedom and liberty.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Florida for those strong words.

We had strong words from the Vatican Chief Justice, as reported by CBS today. They quoted him, the Vatican Chief Justice, as saying:

It is true that the policies of the President of the United States have become progressively more hostile toward Christian civilization. He appears to be a totally secularized man who aggressively promotes anti-life, antifamily policies.

I know he professed Christianity, so I don't necessarily agree with all of those statements; but how profound when the Vatican Chief Justice feels compelled to make that kind of statement.

Mr. Speaker, for the remainder of our time, I yield to my dear friend from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for your leadership in bringing to light an incredibly important issue that is going to be debated right across the street from where we stand today in the House over at the Supreme Court.

The Hobby Lobby case deals with so much more than just one company, but it really deals with one of the fundamental rights that has been laid out in our Constitution, and that is the right of religious freedom.

What does that right really mean? Just how much ability does the Federal Government have to impede upon that right, especially when we talk about the right of a President—in this case, Barack Obama—to put out an edict that would literally take away that right to religious freedom from millions of Americans that enjoy it today and have enjoyed it since the beginning of our country?

If you will look at the rostrum right above the Speaker, it says, "In God We Trust." A lot of people across the country would be surprised because there are school boards, there are other governmental bodies that right now have threats against them if they try to pray before any kind of governmental service.

In schools—in many schools across our country today, that right of religious expression is being challenged by groups every single day, and they threaten different groups, schools, other governmental organizations; yet, here in the House Chamber, we pray at the beginning and the start of every session every day.

We have "In God We Trust" emblazoned right above the Speaker's rostrum, and it is there for a reason.

It is because our Founding Fathers, when they created this Nation, they didn't say these were rights, the rights that they laid out in the Constitution. These were not rights that were given by men. These were rights that were granted through men from God.

Don't take my word for it. These were the writings of our Founding Fathers. They acknowledged God. They praised God. They talked about the great blessings of liberty given to us by God.

Yes, our Founding Fathers said that. This isn't some rightwing nut in the Tea Party. Thomas Jefferson may have been considered one of those rightwing nuts, using the definitions of some of the liberals running around this town today.

But if you look at what this President is doing right now, trying to trample on those religious freedoms, the Hobby Lobby case is the epitome of where those trappings of those rights converge, to our job creators.

This is a business that wants to just run and provide services to people all across this country, a few locations in my district. My wife likes going to Hobby Lobby.

They shouldn't have to be faced with a dilemma every time they cut their paychecks to their employees of whether or not they are going to violate their own religious freedoms just to continue operating as a business in this country.

Nobody should be faced with the threat of our government taking away their religious freedoms just to be able to operate as a business; and yet, that is what is happening right now with the President's mandate through his own health care law.

It is not just limited to businesses, Mr. Speaker. If you look at what is also happening, you know, the President loves talking about a war on women. This President loves dividing this country anywhere he gets the opportunity for political gain to try to divide Americans against each other. How shameless that is.

Where is the President's war on women when it relates to religious freedom?

It is against people like the Little Sisters of the Poor, a Catholic order of nuns that is just trying to do good for people. They are forced to sue the Federal Government because this President, Barack Obama, wants to make Little Sisters of the Poor pay for abortion-inducing drugs as part of their condition of providing health care. Otherwise, they are in violation of the law.

What law, Mr. Speaker, would force Catholic nuns to pay for abortion-inducing drugs just to comply with health care laws?

That is what is at stake here. That is why it is so important, this debate that is going to happen across the street, and that is why it is so important that we all come together to stand up against this kind of oppression of religious freedom.

It wasn't the tenth of all ten amendments in the Bill of Rights. It was the First Amendment that guaranteed religious freedom. That is what we stand here in support of tonight.

I sure hope the Supreme Court hears those arguments as well and recognizes not just what we are talking about tonight, but what our Founding Fathers laid out as one of the basic fundamental tenets of our Nation's constitutional guarantee, and that is the right of religious freedom.

I appreciate all of my colleagues standing up in support of it, as we all do; and hopefully, the Supreme Court hears those pleas and rules the right way.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful to the gentlelady from Missouri for calling so many Members and leading this in this time.

Mr. Speaker, just closing with one line from Benjamin Franklin:

Without God's concurring aid, we will succeed in our political building no better than the builders of Babel confounded by our local partial interests and becoming a byword down through the ages.

Mr. Speaker, we pray for his wisdom for the Supreme Court. I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BENISHEK (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and March 25 on account of attending a family funeral.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 25, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5037. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report presenting the specific amount of staff-years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense Federally Funded Research and Development Center during fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5038. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Repair of Naval Vessels in Foreign Shipyards, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7310; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5039. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Occupant Crash Protection [Docket No.: NHTSA-2013-0121] (RIN: 2127-AK56) received February

25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5040. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-76, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5041. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 102(g) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for FY 1994 and 1995 (Pub. L. 103-236 as amended by 103-415), certification for FY 2014 that no United Nations affiliated agency grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes and condones or seeks the legalization of pedophilia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5042. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report detailing payments made to Cuba as a result of the provision of telecommunications services pursuant to Department of the Treasury specific licenses as required by section 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, as amended by Section 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5043. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5044. A letter from the Chairman, Occupation Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's strategic plan for fiscal years 2014 through 2018; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5045. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Eleventh Coast Guard District Annual Marine Events [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0361] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5046. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0466; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-156-AD; Amendment 39-17749; AD 2014-03-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5047. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0937; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-029-AD; Amendment 39-17762; AD 2014-04-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5048. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; 328 Support Services GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held by AvCraft Aerospace GmbH; Fairchild Dornier GmbH; Dornier Luftfahrt GmbH) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0702; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-181-AD; Amendment 39-17753; AD 2014-03-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received

March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5049. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters) [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0351; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-049-AD; Amendment 39-17770; AD 2 014-04-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5050. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1226; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-122-AD; Amendment 39-17741; AD 2014-03-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5051. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0125; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-119-AD; Amendment 39-17778; AD 2014-05-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5052. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0866; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-131-AD; Amendment 39-17743; AD 2014-03-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5053. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0830; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-128-AD; Amendment 39-17776; AD 2014-05-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5054. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's twentieth annual report prepared in accordance with section 207 of the Andean Trade Preference Act (ATPA); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5055. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting Medicare-Medicaid Coordination Office Fiscal Year 2013 Report to Congress; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

5056. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting fiscal year 2015 Congressional Justification of Budget for the Office of the Inspector General; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 4284. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to encourage greater State input and authority over species and habitat management by allowing States to

propose and implement State Protective Action before species are listed under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 4285. A bill to facilitate State and local governmental entities in developing and implementing private sector job creating programs through local government financing of the installation of energy efficiency, water conservation, and renewable energy generation improvements on privately owned property with the financing to be repaid from assessments that may be levied on the local property tax bill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE (for himself, Mr. COOK, and Mr. YOHIO):

H.R. 4286. A bill to free the private sector to harness domestic energy resources to create jobs and generate economic growth by removing statutory and administrative barriers; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, the Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 4287. A bill to advance the public health by encouraging independent innovators to pursue drug repurposing research and develop new treatments and cures by providing appropriate intellectual property protections for those innovations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 4288. A bill to provide certain protections from civil liability with respect to the emergency administration of opioid overdose drugs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 4289. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 4284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California

H.R. 4285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 3)

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 4286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 gives Congress the power to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper" to execute the enumerated power of regulating "Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes." The titles of the American Energy Renaissance Act deals existing laws affecting the production and transportation of energy among the states and Indian tribes and the export of energy to foreign countries.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 4287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 4288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article, 1 Section 8

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 4289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. COSTA and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 32: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 60: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 118: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 460: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 477: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 487: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 494: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 522: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 580: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 594: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 596: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 647: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 683: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 713: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 721: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 833: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 949: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1020: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 1070: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1141: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1175: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1249: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1250: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1286: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1313: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1318: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1333: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. GARAMENDI.



H.R. 1339: Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
H.R. 1354: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.  
H.R. 1431: Mr. KEATING, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. DEUTCH.  
H.R. 1490: Mr. DESJARLAIS.  
H.R. 1551: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. JONES, and Mr. CRAWFORD.  
H.R. 1563: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 1620: Ms. CHU.  
H.R. 1666: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1692: Mr. JEFFRIES.  
H.R. 1701: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.  
H.R. 1725: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. SERRANO.  
H.R. 1726: Mr. HANNA.  
H.R. 1728: Mr. HIMES.  
H.R. 1761: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.  
H.R. 1763: Mr. TIERNEY.  
H.R. 1772: Mr. STEWART.  
H.R. 1775: Mr. TIERNEY.  
H.R. 1915: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. LEE of California.  
H.R. 1998: Mr. UPTON.  
H.R. 2084: Mr. ROSS.  
H.R. 2143: Mr. GERLACH.  
H.R. 2213: Mr. VARGAS.  
H.R. 2254: Mr. BYRNE.  
H.R. 2315: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
H.R. 2405: Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 2415: Mr. LEWIS.  
H.R. 2429: Mr. LATTI.  
H.R. 2453: Mr. GERLACH.  
H.R. 2536: Mr. ROYCE.  
H.R. 2540: Mr. JONES.  
H.R. 2548: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. YODER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.  
H.R. 2591: Mr. COHEN, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 2656: Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 2662: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. WALDEN.  
H.R. 2663: Mr. MORAN and Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 2670: Mr. RUSH.  
H.R. 2746: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.  
H.R. 2750: Mr. TIPTON.  
H.R. 2773: Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
H.R. 2788: Mr. HECK of Washington.  
H.R. 2807: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. TONKO.  
H.R. 2825: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
H.R. 2870: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. HIMES.  
H.R. 2892: Mr. HOLDING.  
H.R. 2901: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. CONNOLLY.  
H.R. 2939: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. LOEBSACK.  
H.R. 2957: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
H.R. 2989: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Mr. DOYLE.  
H.R. 2994: Mr. FARR, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
H.R. 2996: Mr. BENTIVOLIO and Mrs. WAGNER.  
H.R. 3040: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.  
H.R. 3043: Mr. DAINES.  
H.R. 3090: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.  
H.R. 3162: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.  
H.R. 3179: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 3211: Mr. FORBES.  
H.R. 3303: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. OLSON.  
H.R. 3322: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 3335: Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. SHUSTER.  
H.R. 3344: Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
H.R. 3367: Mr. HARPER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. RENACCI.  
H.R. 3383: Mr. CICILLINE.  
H.R. 3395: Mr. TIERNEY.  
H.R. 3461: Mr. BERA of California.  
H.R. 3478: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 3493: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. UPTON.  
H.R. 3494: Mr. NEAL, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. CARNEY.  
H.R. 3500: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H.R. 3505: Mr. LANCE, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.  
H.R. 3513: Mr. O'ROURKE.  
H.R. 3518: Mr. HONDA.  
H.R. 3530: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.  
H.R. 3544: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. FORBES and Mr. VEASEY.  
H.R. 3571: Mr. LANCE and Mr. ISRAEL.  
H.R. 3600: Mr. KILMER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SIREs, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. HANABUSA.  
H.R. 3619: Mr. FARR.  
H.R. 3620: Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD.  
H.R. 3698: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
H.R. 3708: Mr. MASSIE, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. JONES, and Mr. DESANTIS.  
H.R. 3712: Mr. BERA of California.  
H.R. 3714: Mr. JONES and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.  
H.R. 3717: Mr. NUNES.  
H.R. 3723: Mr. MEEHAN.  
H.R. 3728: Mr. LATTI, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JONES.  
H.R. 3740: Ms. FUDGE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. BERA of California.  
H.R. 3742: Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LATTI, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. OLSON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LANCE, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. BARROW of Georgia.  
H.R. 3747: Mr. PETERSON.  
H.R. 3761: Mr. CARTER and Mr. GUTHRIE.  
H.R. 3769: Mr. JONES.  
H.R. 3771: Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD.  
H.R. 3776: Mr. COOPER.  
H.R. 3854: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 3877: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 3930: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. RENACCI.  
H.R. 3954: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. HINOJOSA.  
H.R. 3989: Mr. COTTON and Mr. COFFMAN.  
H.R. 3991: Mr. GARDNER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
H.R. 4012: Mr. KLINE.  
H.R. 4016: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.  
H.R. 4031: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. SCHOCK.  
H.R. 4057: Mr. DINGELL and Mr. KILDEE.  
H.R. 4058: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 4080: Mr. RUSH.  
H.R. 4092: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
H.R. 4106: Mr. COTTON and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.  
H.R. 4108: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. COSTA.  
H.R. 4112: Mr. LEWIS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 4141: Mr. JONES and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.  
H.R. 4148: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CHU, and Mr. CONYERS.  
H.R. 4149: Mr. CRAMER.  
H.R. 4154: Mr. GERLACH.  
H.R. 4155: Mr. STOCKMAN and Mr. PERRY.  
H.R. 4162: Mr. JEFFRIES.  
H.R. 4164: Mr. CHABOT.  
H.R. 4169: Mr. WELCH and Mr. O'ROURKE.  
H.R. 4184: Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H.R. 4188: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
H.R. 4190: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.  
H.R. 4205: Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 4208: Ms. WATERS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD.  
H.R. 4213: Mr. GRIMM.  
H.R. 4225: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.  
H.R. 4227: Mr. SIREs.  
H.R. 4229: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, and Ms. GABBARD.  
H.R. 4249: Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
H.R. 4254: Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 4255: Mr. McDERMOTT and Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY.  
H.R. 4278: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. COOK.  
H.J. Res. 43: Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. BARBER.  
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. PIERLUISI and Mr. ENGEL.  
H. Con. Res. 78: Ms. BASS.  
H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
H. Con. Res. 91: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. CONNOLLY.  
H. Res. 72: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.  
H. Res. 109: Mr. COOPER.  
H. Res. 188: Mr. TIERNEY.  
H. Res. 231: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. CLEAVER.  
H. Res. 417: Mr. McCLINTOCK.  
H. Res. 418: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SHERMAN.  
H. Res. 456: Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H. Res. 480: Mr. HANNA.  
H. Res. 494: Ms. FOX, Mr. FORBES, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. STEWART, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ROSS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. BERA of California.

#### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

##### OFFERED BY Mr. BISHOP OF UTAH

The amendment filed to H.R. 1459 by me does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of House Rule XXI.